REPORT

FROM THE

SELECT COMMITTEE

ON

BLEACHING AND DYEING WORKS;

WITH THE

PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE,

AND

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

Ordered, by The House of Commons, *to be Printed,*
11 *May* 1858.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

Martis, 16° *die Februarii*, 1858.

Ordered, That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the circumstances connected with the Employment of Women and Children in the Bleaching and Dyeing Establishments in England, Scotland and Ireland; and to consider how far it may be necessary or expedient to extend to those Establishments Provisions regulating such Employment; and to report their Observations thereupon to The House.

Committee nominated of—

Mr. Butt.
Lord John Manners.
Mr. Crook.
Mr. Kirk.
Mr. Baxter.
Mr. Massey.
Mr. Dalglish.
Mr. Clark.
Mr. Cheetham.
Lord Naas.
Mr. Cobbett.
Mr. Wise.
Mr. Turner.
Mr. Packe.
Mr. Davison.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for Persons, Papers and Records.

Ordered, That Five be the Quorum of the Committee.

Martis, 23° *die Martii*, 1858.

Ordered, That Lord John Manners be added to the Committee.

Lunæ, 19° *die Aprilis*, 1858.

Ordered, That Colonel Forde be added to the Committee.

Martis, 11° *die Maii*, 1858.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to report the Minutes of Evidence taken before them to The House.

REPORT - - - - - - - - - - - - - p. iii
PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE - - - - - p. iv
MINUTES OF EVIDENCE - - - - - - - - - p. 1

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

REPORT.

THE SELECT COMMITTEE appointed to inquire into the circumstances connected with the Employment of WOMEN and CHILDREN in the BLEACHING and DYEING ESTABLISHMENTS in *England*, *Scotland*, and *Ireland*; and to consider how far it may be necessary or expedient to extend to those Establishments Provisions regulating such Employment, and to report their Observations thereupon to the House;——HAVE considered the matters to them referred, and have agreed to the following REPORT:—

THE Committee, after fully weighing the Evidence laid before them, concur in thinking that the circumstances connected with the employment of women and children in bleaching and dyeing establishments are deserving of consideration, and that the grievances alleged are in part susceptible of remedy.

The Committee, however, are of opinion that the labour of women and children in bleaching, dyeing, finishing, making up and packing work should not be restricted by legislative enactment, for the following reasons:

1. That great dissimilarity exists between the case of factories and bleachworks. The spinner dealing with his own material has means of ensuring regular employment, which the bleacher, receiving only the property of others, does not possess in the same degree.

2. That the operatives are not employed in bleachworks during the whole of the time they are on the premises, as is invariably the case in factories; periods of interruption being inevitable from the nature of the employment.

3. That the nature of the occupation of women and children in bleachworks is, with some exceptions, healthy, light, and cleanly, and is preferred by them to that in factories, though the latter is restricted by law.

4. That although objections arise to calendering, making up, and packing departments, and to the high temperature in the stoves and finishing department, where women and young persons and children are principally employed in connexion with bleaching and dyeing works, yet as finishing, calendering, making up, and packing are frequently carried on in warehouses, any restrictions placed on the former should in fairness be applied to the latter, a measure which the Committee are not prepared to recommend. Evidence, Q. 783, 784 and 785; 3172 to 3176

5. That linen bleaching, which is chiefly carried on in the North of Ireland and the East of Scotland, is a very healthy occupation, conducted very much in the open air, and materially influenced by the seasons; that consequently, under favourable circumstances, the operatives occasionally work extra hours; but that, on the other hand, in time of frost, mid-winter, and when water is scarce, they often do not work 10 hours a day; but as, in conformity with the wishes of the working people and many of the masters, the hours of work for young persons, females, and children have been of late reduced, in many instances by voluntary arrangement, the Committee earnestly recommend the bleachers and dyers of the United Kingdom to consider whether such arrangements might not be more generally adopted, to the advantage of all parties concerned, in the various processes of their business.

11 *May* 1858.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE.

Jovis, 25° *die Martii*, 1858.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Cobbett.	Mr. Packe.
Mr. Kirk.	Mr. Dalglish.
Mr. Wise.	

Mr. COBBETT was called to the Chair.

Committee deliberated.

[Adjourned to Thursday, 15th April, at Twelve o'clock.

Jovis, 15° *die Aprilis*, 1858.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. COBBETT, in the Chair.

Mr. Wise.	Mr. Dalglish.
Mr. Cheetham.	Mr. Kirk.
Mr. Clark.	Mr. Davison.
Mr. Packe.	Mr. Massey.
Mr. Turner.	Mr. Baxter.

The Committee examined Mr. *H. Charlton.*

[Adjourned to Thursday, 22d instant, at One o'clock.

Jovis, 22° *die Aprilis*, 1858.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. COBBETT, in the Chair.

Mr. Packe.	Col. Forde.
Mr. Turner.	Mr. Crook.
Mr. Kirk.	Mr. Cheetham.
Mr. Davison.	

The Committee examined *Henry Wilkie*, *Daniel Forbes*, *Duncan Forbes*, and *John Waring.*

[Adjourned to Tuesday, at Twelve o'clock.

Martis, 27° *die Aprilis*, 1858.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. COBBETT, in the Chair.

Mr. Clark.	Mr. Baxter.
Mr. Turner.	Mr. Massey.
Mr. Kirk.	Mr. Crook.
Mr. Davison.	Col. Forde.
Lord John Manners.	

Motion made, and question put and agreed to (*Mr. Davison*), "That no further evidence be received, save from witnesses examined by the Committee whose character has been impeached by witnesses subsequently produced."

The

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

The Committee examined Mr. *Turner*, a Member of the Committee, with reference to certain allegations made by a witness named Waring, with regard to the evidence of Mr. Charlton.

The Committee deliberated. The Chairman was requested to propose a Draft of Report.

[Adjourned to Tuesday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Martis, 4° die Maii, 1858.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. COBBETT, in the Chair.

Mr. Baxter.	Mr. Cheetham.
Mr. Davison.	Mr. Wise.
Mr. Kirk.	Mr. Crook.
Mr. Turner.	Col. Forde.
Lord John Manners.	Mr. Massey.
Mr. Packe.	Mr. Dalglish.
Mr. Clark.	

The Draft of Report proposed by the Chairman was read 1°, as follows:—

"The Committee having considered carefully the subject referred to them, are of opinion that in certain branches of the Bleaching and Dyeing business carried on in England and in Scotland, the hours of daily work for young persons and females are excessive; and that such excessive hours of work frequently cause great bodily suffering to the people referred to, and deprive them of opportunities for mental culture and moral instruction.

"And they are further of opinion that it is desirable, in conformity with the wishes of the working people, and many of the masters, that the hours of work for young persons and females should be reduced in number; and that, although improvement in this respect has taken place partially of late by voluntary arrangement between masters and workpeople, that improvement (as experience shows) is not likely to be either general or lasting unless secured by legislative enactment."

A Draft of Report, proposed by Mr. Turner and Mr. Kirk, was read 1°, as follows:—

"The Committee are of opinion that the labour of women and children should not be restricted in bleaching, dyeing, finishing, making up, and packing works, because,—

"1. There is a broad distinction between the description of labour required in those works and any hitherto legislated for.

"2. Great dissimilarity exists between the case of factories and bleachworks. The spinner dealing with his own material can always ensure constant and regular employment; whereas the bleacher, receiving only the property of others, is unable to command regular or constant supplies of work.

"3. The allegations which have been made of the excessive labour of women and children in bleachworks have rested mainly on the assumption that the operatives have been fully employed during the whole of the time they have been on the premises, as is invariably the case in factories; whereas the contrary is the fact as regards bleachworks, periods of interruption being inevitable from the nature of the employment.

"4. That neither the merchant, commission agent, nor bleacher can so control the supply of goods as to ensure 10 hours' regular labour, as such supply must depend upon the immediate demands of the home and foreign markets.

"5. That the nature of the occupation of women and children in bleachworks is healthy light, and cleanly, and is preferred by them to that in factories, though the latter is restricted by law.

"6. The objections arise to finishing, calendering, making up, and packing departments, where women and young persons and children are principally employed in connexion with bleaching and dyeing works, but as finishing, calendering, making up, and packing are frequently carried on in warehouses, any restrictions placed on the former should be applied to the latter, which would be a measure manifestly impracticable, from the evidence taken before the Committee.

"7. That the Print Works Act, 1845, was originally drawn to include bleachworks, and permitted labour for 14 hours per day, whilst the four last Bills restrict labour to 10 hours Thus the stringency is greater, whilst it is shown the hours worked are shorter.

"8. The work performed by women and children in bleachworks, though extremely well adapted for their labour, could be efficiently performed by young men. The probable

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

result of legislative restriction of their labour, therefore, would be the substitution of adult labour.

"9. Foreign competition has of late years greatly increased, and any further restriction on the bleachers of this country would operate as a protective duty on the foreign bleacher.

"10. That linen bleaching is a healthy occupation wherever carried on, being very much an out-of-door operation; consequently subject to changes of weather and of seasons, which materially interrupt and affect the chemical processes. Therefore any legislative interference would be alike injurious to employers and employed. In winter it is manifestly impossible to work 10½ hours a day in the open air, even in a mild season; in time of frost nothing can be done; again, in summer, interruptions from want of water are frequent; both masters and men therefore require extra exertion, and to work overtime, to bring up arrears thus caused by the seasons or the weather.

"11. Linens are generally finished by a process called beetling—a tedious operation, mainly carried out by water power, which water must be used as it flows, or be lost. If, therefore, persons could only be employed within certain hours, it is evident that half the power of every stream would be lost to the occupiers, as no person could make a pond or impede the flow of that stream without being subject to an action from flour millers or others below him, not restricted by law. The attendance on beetling-engines is light labour, and not continuous, recurring at fixed intervals only, so that the workpeople are not occupied much more than half their time."

Motion made and question proposed, "That the Draft of Report proposed by the Chairman be now taken into consideration.—Amendment proposed (*Mr. Kirk*), "To leave out the word 'Chairman,' in order to insert the words 'Mr. Turner and Mr. Kirk.'" Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part:

Ayes, 5.	Noes, 7.
Mr. Crook.	Mr. Baxter.
Lord John Manners.	Col. Forde.
Mr. Packe.	Mr. Davison.
Mr. Massey.	Mr. Kirk.
Mr. Wise.	Mr. Turner.
	Mr. Clark.
	Mr. Cheetham.

Words inserted accordingly. The Committee proceeded with the consideration of the Draft of Report (*Mr. Kirk*).

Motion made and question proposed (*Mr. Kirk*), "The Committee are of opinion that the labour of women and children should not be restricted in bleaching, dyeing, finishing, making up, and packing works, because."—Amendment proposed (*Mr. Wise*), "To leave out all the words after the word 'Committee,' in order to add these words, 'after fully weighing the evidence laid before them, concur in thinking that the circumstances connected with the employment of women and children in bleaching and dyeing establishments are deserving of consideration, and that the grievances alleged are in part susceptible of remedy.'"

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part," put, and negatived.

Words added. Question, as amended, put and agreed to.

Paragraph 1 (*Mr. Kirk*) negatived.

Motion made and question proposed (*Mr. Wise*), "The Committee, however, are of opinion that the labour of women and children in bleaching, dyeing, finishing, making up, and packing works should not be restricted by legislative enactment for the following reasons."—Amendment proposed (*Mr. Crook*), "To leave out all the words after the word 'Committee,' in order to add these words, 'is of opinion that there ought to be a limit fixed by law to the hours of labour of women and children in bleachworks.'" Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out," stand part. Committee divided:

Ayes, 8.	Noes, 5.
Mr. Baxter.	Mr. Crook.
Colonel Forde.	Lord J. Manners.
Mr. Davison.	Mr. Packe.
Mr. Kirk.	Mr. Massey.
Mr. Turner.	Mr. Butt.
Mr. Clark.	
Mr. Cheetham.	
Mr. Wise.	

Mr. *Dalglish* declined to vote on the ground of his possessing a strong pecuniary interest as an employer of that particular class of labourers.

Main question put and agreed to.

Paragraph 2, Motion made and question proposed (*Mr. Kirk*), "Great dissimilarity exists between the case of factories and bleachworks. The spinner dealing with his own material

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

material can always ensure constant and regular employment; whereas the bleacher, receiving only the property of others, is unable to command regular or constant supplies of work."—Amendment proposed (*Mr. Massey*), To omit all the words after the word "material," in order to add these words, "Has means of ensuring regular employment, which the bleacher, receiving only the property of others, does not possess in the same degree."—Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part," put and negatived.—Question proposed, "That the proposed words be there added."—Amendment proposed to the proposed amendment, (*Mr. Crook*), After "employment," to insert these words, "if possessed of adequate capital, and chooses to make goods at the risk of their being attended with profit or loss."

Question put, "That the words be there inserted."

Ayes, 3.	Noes, 11.
Mr. Crook.	Mr. Baxter.
Mr. Packe.	Colonel Forde.
Mr. Butt.	Mr. Davison.
	Mr. Kirk.
	Mr. Turner.
	Mr. Dalglish.
	Lord J. Manners.
	Mr. Massey.
	Mr. Clark.
	Mr. Cheetham.
	Mr. Wise.

Further amendment proposed to the proposed amendment (*Mr. Butt*), To add at the end of the paragraph these words:—"But at the same time, the Committee think it right to state that they have received evidence that were the bleachers to limit their work to certain hours, the merchants who send their orders to the bleachers would without any serious inconvenience find means to meet the altered circumstances under which their orders would be executed." Question put. Committee divided:

Ayes, 5.	Noes, 9.
Mr. Crook.	Mr. Baxter.
Lord J. Manners.	Colonel Forde.
Mr. Packe.	Mr. Davison.
Mr. Massey.	Mr. Kirk.
Mr. Butt.	Mr. Turner.
	Mr. Dalglish.
	Mr. Clark.
	Mr. Cheetham.
	Mr. Wise.

Proposed amendment (*Mr. Massey*), put and agreed to.

Question, as amended, put and agreed to.

Paragraph 3 amended, and agreed to.

Paragraph 4 negatived.

Paragragh 5, Motion made, and question proposed, "That the nature of the occupation of women and children in bleachworks is, with some exceptions, healthy, light, and cleanly, and is preferred by them to that in factories, though the latter is restricted by law."

Question put. The Committee divided:

Ayes, 11.	Noes, 2.
Mr. Baxter.	Mr. Crook.
Colonel Forde.	Mr. Butt.
Mr. Davison.	
Mr. Kirk.	
Mr. Turner.	
Mr. Dalglish.	
Lord J. Manners.	
Mr. Packe.	
Mr. Clark.	
Mr. Cheetham.	
Mr. Wise.	

Remaining proposed paragraphs negatived.

Motion made and question proposed (*Mr. Baxter*), "That linen bleaching, which is chiefly carried on in the North of Ireland and the East of Scotland, is a very healthy occupation, conducted very much in the open air, and materially influenced by the seasons; that consequently, under favourable circumstances, the operatives occasionally work extra

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

hours, but that, on the other hand, in time of frost, mid-winter, and when water is scarce, they often do not work 10 hours a day."

Amendment proposed (*Mr. Crook*), To leave out all the words after the word "That," in order to add these words, "This Committee is not prepared to state fairly the objectionable practices which prevail in the bleaching trade, having heard insufficient evidence with reference to the customs in the West of Scotland, where the great mass of women and children are employed.—Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part." Committee divided:

Ayes, 12.	Noe, 1.
Mr. Baxter.	Mr. Crook.
Mr. Davison.	
Mr. Kirk.	
Colonel Forde.	
Mr. Turner.	
Mr. Dalglish.	
Lord J. Manners.	
Mr. Packe.	
Mr. Clark.	
Mr. Cheetham.	
Mr. Wise.	
Mr. Butt.	

Amendment proposed (*Mr. Wise*), At the end of the paragraph, to add these words, "But as in conformity with the wishes of the working people and many of the masters, the hours of work for young persons, females, and children have been of late reduced, in many instances by voluntary arrangement, the Committee earnestly recommend the bleachers and dyers of the United Kingdom to consider whether such arrangements might not be more generally adopted, to the advantage of all parties concerned in the various processes of the business."

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Amendment proposed to the proposed amendment (*Mr. Crook*), To leave out all the words after the word "but," in order to add those words, "The Committee earnestly recommend the master bleachers of Bolton and the neighbourhood to follow the example of the master bleachers of the West of Scotland, who would be most affected by law, and waive their opposition to a reasonable regulation."

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed amendment." Committee divided:

Ayes, 12.	Noe, 1.
Mr. Baxter.	Mr. Crook.
Colonel Forde.	
Mr. Davison.	
Mr. Kirk.	
Mr. Turner.	
Mr. Dalglish.	
Lord J. Manners.	
Mr. Packe.	
Mr. Clark.	
Mr. Cheetham.	
Mr. Wise.	
Mr. Butt.	

Proposed amendment (*Mr. Wise*), put and agreed to.—Question, as amended, put and agreed to.

Question, "That the following, together with the Minutes of Evidence, and Appendix, be the Report to the House," put, and agreed to.

"The Committee, after fully weighing the evidence laid before them, concur in thinking that the circumstances connected with the employment of women and children in bleaching and dyeing establishments are deserving of consideration, and that the grievances alleged are in part susceptible of remedy.

"The Committee, however, are of opinion that the labour of women and children in bleaching, dyeing, finishing, making up and packing work should not be restricted by legislative enactment, for the following reasons:—

"1. That great dissimilarity exists between the case of factories and bleachworks. The spinner dealing with his own material has means of ensuring regular employment, which the bleacher, receiving only the property of others, does not possess in the same degree.

"2. That the operatives are not employed in bleachworks during the whole of the time they are on the premises, as is invariably the case in factories; periods of interruption being inevitable from the nature of the employment.

"3. That

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

"3. That the nature of the occupation of women and children in bleachworks is, with some exceptions, healthy, light, and cleanly, and is preferred by them to that in factories, though the latter is restricted by law.

"4. That although objections arise to calendering, making up, and packing departments, and to the high temperature in the stoves and finishing department, where women and young persons and children are principally employed in connexion with bleaching and dyeing works, yet as finishing, calendering, making up, and packing are frequently carried on in warehouses, any restrictions placed on the former should in fairness be applied to the latter, a measure which the Committee are not prepared to recommend.

"5. That linen bleaching, which is chiefly carried on in the North of Ireland and the East of Scotland, is a very healthy occupation, conducted very much in the open air, and materially influenced by the seasons; that consequently, under favourable circumstances, the operatives occasionally work extra hours; but that, on the other hand, in time of frost, mid-winter, and when water is scarce, they often do not work 10 hours a day; but as, in conformity with the wishes of the working people and many of the masters, the hours of work for young persons, females, and children have been of late reduced, in many instances by voluntary arrangement, the Committee earnestly recommend the bleachers and dyers of the United Kingdom to consider whether such arrangements might not be more generally adopted, to the advantage of all parties concerned, in the various processes of their business."

EXPENSES OF WITNESSES.

NAME of WITNESS.	Profession or Condition.	From whence Summoned.	Number of Days absent from Home under Orders of Committee.	Expenses of Journey to London and back.	Allowance during absence from Home.	TOTAL Expenses allowed to Witness.
				£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
H. Wilkie - - -	Artisan - -	Perth -	4	8 – –	3 – –	11 – –
Daniel Forbes - - -	Inspector of Factory.	Dundee -	5	9 – –	5 5 –	14 5 –
Duncan Forbes - -	Ditto - -	Perth -	4	8 – –	4 4 –	12 4 –
John Waring - - -	Artisan - -	Bolton -	3	4 10 –	2 5 –	6 15 –
					£.	44 4 –

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

LIST OF WITNESSES.

Jovis, 15° *die Aprilis*, 1858.

Henry Charlton, Esq. - - - - - - - - - p. 1

Jovis, 22° *die Aprilis*, 1858.

Mr. Daniel Forbes - - - - - - - - - - p. 9
Mr. Duncan Feargus Forbes - - - - - - - - p. 14
Mr. Henry Wilkie - - - - - - - - - - p. 20
John Waring - - - - - - - - - - p. 27

Martis, 27° *die Aprilis*, 1858.

James Aspinall Turner, Esq., M.P. - - - - - - p. 33

Pnnted image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

Jovis, 15° die Aprilis, 1858.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Baxter.	Mr. Kirk.
Mr. Cheetham.	Mr. Massey.
Mr. Clark.	Mr. Packe.
Mr. Cobbett.	Mr. Turner.
Mr. Dalglish.	Mr. Wise.
Mr. Davison.	

JOHN MORGAN COBBETT, Esq., IN THE CHAIR.

Henry Charlton, Esq., called in; and Examined.

1. *Chairman.*] WHAT are you?—A Calenderer, Finisher, Maker-up, and Packer.

2. Where?—In Manchester.

3. Mr. *Turner.*] What is the name of your firm?—Robert Charlton & Sons.

4. Have you read the evidence given last year by Stewart Fletcher relative to the hours during which the men and boys worked in your establishment from the 21st of July to the end of the week commencing 27th of October 1856?—I have.

5. That statement was said to be furnished by a man named Thomas Brackin; have you such a person in your employment?—We have.

6. Is Thomas Brackin's statement correct as given by Stewart Fletcher's answer to Question 1725, as to the hours during which he and others worked from the 21st of July to the 1st of November 1856?—It is not correct.

7. Have you prepared any statement, as extracted from your own books, of the actual time during which he and others worked during that period?—I have; I cannot state what was worked each day, but I can state what was worked each week, and the amount paid to Thomas Brackin for such work, including overtime.

8. Referring to that statement, during the week commencing July the 21st, 1856, Thomas Brackin says that he worked overtime 22 hours. Guided by your own books, how many hours overtime did he actually work in that week?—He worked nine hours overtime, and was paid for nine.

9. The following week, commencing the 28th of July, he states that he worked 19 hours overtime; what is the fact?—He lost two hours and a half that week, and was deducted for the time.

10. Then instead of working 19 hours, he worked two hours and a half short time?—Yes.

11. The following week, commencing the 4th August, he states that he worked 22 hours overtime; how many hours overtime did he work?—Four hours and a half, and was paid for the same.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

H. Charlton, Esq.

15 April 1858.

12. In the following week, commencing the 11th of August, he states that he worked 17 hours overtime; what is the fact?—He worked nine hours overtime, and was paid for the same.

13. There is a great discrepancy on the other side, as appears from a memorandum which I have. In the week beginning the 18th of August, he states that he worked overtime nine hours; how many hours did he work overtime?—He worked 21 hours, and was paid for the same.

14. In the week beginning the 25th of August, he states that he worked 21 hours overtime; what is the fact?—He worked 19 hours overtime.

15. In the week commencing September the 1st, he states that he worked overtime 22 hours?—He worked 22 hours overtime.

16. In the week commencing September the 8th, he states that he worked overtime 15 hours?—He worked 15 hours overtime.

17. In the week commencing September the 15th, he states that he worked overtime 12 hours?—He worked 12 hours overtime.

18. In the week commencing September the 22d, he states that he worked overtime eight hours?—He worked eight hours overtime.

19. In the week commencing September the 29th, he states that he worked overtime seven hours?—He worked three hours overtime.

20. In the week commencing October 6th, he states that he worked eight hours overtime?—He worked three hours overtime.

21. In the week commencing October 13th, he states that he worked eight hours overtime?—He worked 11 hours overtime.

22. In the week commencing October 20th, he states that he worked 19 hours overtime?—He worked 15 hours overtime.

23. In the week commencing October 27th, he states that he worked 14 hours overtime?—He worked 11 hours overtime.

24. I have now gone through the whole period; how many hours does he state that he worked overtime for the 15 weeks from the 21st of July to the 1st of November?—He states 223 hours.

25. How many hours of overtime did he work?—162½ hours.

26. From that you deduct the two and a half hours during which he worked short time?—Yes.

27. That makes how many hours?—160 hours overtime.

28. Deducting the 160 actual over hours that he worked during that period from the 223 which he states, what is the error?—Sixty-three hours; Fletcher's statement is 63 hours more than Brackin worked.

29. And he was paid according to your books, and made no complaint?—He was not only paid for that number of hours, but it is his own statement furnished to the cashier.

30. Then you infer that the statement which he authorised Stewart Fletcher to hand in here was a very incorrect one?—It is quite incorrect; I have the wage book to prove it; his wages were 26*s.* per week; his overtime was 6*d.* per hour; every 6*d.* which he is paid over and above 26*s.* per week represents an hour.

31. He selected this particular period to make a return, namely, from the 21st of July to the 1st of November; was that a fair period to select?—It was very unfair indeed; he should have taken the whole year if he had wished to give a fair statement, even supposing that his statement had been correct. The months of July, August, September, and October are the busiest months that we have in the year; during those months we are busy for the West India markets; we finish, make up, and pack more goods for the West India markets during those months than we do in all the other months of the year put together; therefore, selecting this period when we were exceedingly busy, as I before stated, for those markets, was not fair.

32. Have you prepared what you consider a fair statement, namely, the average hours per day during which Brackin worked throughout the whole 52 weeks of 1856?—I have.

33. Will you read that paper, giving the number of hours each week?—January the 5th, 60 hours; January the 12th, 61 hours; January the 19th, 61 hours; January the 26th, 59 hours; February the 2d, 49 hours; February the

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

the 9th, 63 hours; February the 16th, 69 hours; February the 23d, 60 hours; March the 1st, 60 hours; March the 8th, 65 hours; March the 15th, 70 hours; March the 22d, 54 hours; March the 29th, 60 hours; April the 5th, 60 hours; April the 12th, 60 hours; April the 19th, 61 hours; April the 26th, 60 hours; May the 3d, 65 hours; May the 10th, 62 hours; May the 17th, 25 hours; May the 24th, 49½ hours; May the 31st, 60 hours; June the 7th, 60 hours; June the 14th, 60 hours; June the 21st, 60 hours; June the 28th, 63 hours; July the 5th, 62 hours; July the 12th, 63 hours; July the 19th, 58 hours; July the 26th, 69 hours; August the 2d, 57½ hours; August the 9th, 64½ hours; August the 16th, 69 hours; August the 23d, 81 hours; August the 30th, 79 hours; September the 6th, 82 hours; September the 13th, 75 hours; September the 20th, 72 hours; September the 27th, 68 hours; October the 4th, 63 hours; October the 11th, 63 hours; October the 18th, 71 hours; October the 25th, 75 hours; November the 1st, 71 hours; November the 8th, 64 hours; November the 15th, 67 hours; November the 22d, 63 hours; November the 29th, 70 hours; December the 6th, 57 hours; December the 13th, 70 hours; December the 20th, 64 hours; December the 27th, 60½ hours; being an average during the year 1856 of 63¾ hours per week, or a fraction more than 10½ hours per day.

34. Then Thomas Brackin and the rest of your men worked on an average during the year 1856, 10¼ hours per day?—Yes; there might be some who worked a little longer than that, for sometimes the makers-up and the stiffeners would be working together; sometimes the makers-up and the finishers, and then the makers-up might not be working. The hours vary a little from these, but not very much. I have gone through the hours of the other men who worked with Thomas Brackin, and their average is the same.

35. Is it possible for you so to conduct your business as that all your people should work 10½ hours each, and every day, and neither more nor less than those hours every day?—We could not do it.

36. Why?—Because we have frequently goods sent in from the merchants at five or six o'clock in the evening which have to be calendered, made up, packed, and forwarded the same night; sometimes they are for the completion of an order, the vessel sailing the following day, and unless they went off that night there would not be the proper assortment of the order.

37. Can the merchants avoid that, do you think?—No, I think not.

38. What do you consider your regular hours of ordinary work, except when you are pressed by the merchants to execute your work more quickly?—From eight o'clock in the morning till eight at night, one hour being allowed for dinner, and half an hour for tea; on Saturday from eight o'clock in the morning till four in the afternoon, half an hour being allowed for dinner, making 60 hours in the week.

39. Then, in fact, excepting from the peculiar nature of your business, you are at the present time actually observing what are called factory hours?—I believe we are.

40. I believe your establishment is a very old one in Manchester?—It is, upwards of 60 years.

41. How many persons do you employ, and how are they employed; have you any statement of that with you?—Yes; we employ 15 persons upwards of 18 years of age, connected with calendering and finishing; 15 persons under 18 years of age in the same employment; we employ 81 persons upwards of 18 years of age connected with making-up, packing, hooking, stitching, assorting goods and examining goods, and 35 under 18 years of age in the same. This is the same class of labour that is employed in making-up and packing establishments that are not finishers, and also the same that is employed in warehouses.

42. Have some of your servants been employed in your establishment for a very long period?—Some of them have been a very long time.

43. Name the longest period during which any of your servants have been connected with your works?—We have one man of the name of Joseph Hatton who is 74 years of age; he has been 58 years employed upon the same ground that our present premises are standing upon, with us and with other parties whom we succeeded.

44. It is the same business conducted under a different name?—Yes.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

H. Charlton, Esq.

15 April 1858.

45. How long has Thomas Brackin, who furnished the information given to this Committee, been employed in your establishment?—Thirty-one years.

46. Are the hands in your establishment averse to legislation on this subject, unless the warehouses are included?—They are averse to legislation unless the warehouses are included, and they have signed a paper to that effect. There are 54 persons who have signed the paper who are upwards of 18 years of age.

47. Whose name stands at the head of that paper?—Thomas Brackin's.

[*The Witness read the same, which is as follows*] :

We, the undersigned, in the employ of Messrs. Robert Charlton & Sons, consider it would be a serious injury and injustice to our employers if a Bill for limiting the hours of labour pass the Legislature which does not include warehouses.

Our employers have laid out a large capital in providing offices and warehouse-rooms for merchants, with accommodation for making-up and packing their goods: if our hours of labour were limited from six to six, and warehouses not restricted, the merchants in our employers' premises would be compelled to take warehouses themselves.

Some of us are in favour of a limited "Hours Bill;" but unless the warehouses are included, we would rather forego the Bill than that our employers should be injured by it.

NAME.	AGE.	Years Employed.	REMARKS.
Thomas Brackin - - -	44	31 years	- - This is the man who furnished Fletcher with the three months' time account.
William Field - - -	49	28 „	Two sons apprenticed here.
Joseph Halton - - -	74	58 „	
Wm. Heathcote - - -	43	28 „	
Hugh M'Donald - - -	33	21 „	
Henry Blaze - - -	40	23 „	One son working here.
Thomas Halton - - -	38	17 „	Son and nephew working here.
Joseph Halton, jun. - -	31	14 „	
Wm. Inlan - - - -	29	18 „	
James + Atkinson - -	53	38 „	Two sons apprenticed here.
B. Blakeley - - -	24	14 „	
Charles Brookes - - -	22	10 „	
George Cookson - - -	21	7 „	- - This man's father worked here until his death; 20 years' servitude.
		7 „	
R. Jones - - - -	20	8 „	
T. Fallowfield - - -	19		
John Smith - - -	29	6 „	
S. Richardson - - -	21	3 „	
Joseph Mahomet - -	31	17 „	
William Ogden - - -	38	17 „	
John Osborne - - -	27	7 months	
Thos. Lee - - - -	21	8 years	
J. Heathcote - - -	28	7 „	- - This man's father and grandfather worked here up to the time of their deaths.
Francis Sighe - - -	23	7 months	
James Morris - - -	20	5 years	
E. Phillips - - - -	19	1½ „	
John Brotherton - - -	23	2½ „	
J. Wilkinson - - -	23	6 months	
G. Jones - - - -	24	3 „	
Sidney + Smith - -	18	9 „	
John Venables - - -	23	13 „	
Herbert Bell - - -	36	10 „	
James Hamilton - - -	21	1 year	
William Gee - - -	29	6 years	
John + Hope - - -	29	1 year	
Richd. Saddler + - -	25	3 years	
James Lyons + - - -	24	2 „	
Robert Taylor + - -	28	3 „	
Saml. Rastrick + - -	43	25 „	
D. Riddick - - - -	23	6½ „	
H. R. Mott + - - -	27	7 „	
John + Prince - - -	19	2 „	
Thomas Edwards - -	27	3 „	
Samuel Holt - - -	71	3½ „	

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

NAME.	AGE.	Years Employed.	REMARKS.
Michael Mockrarle - -	20	2 years	
Samuel Smith - - -	18	1 „	
Stephen Macnay - - -	23	1½ „	
W. Whittaker - - -	35	2½ „	
Joseph Wild - - -	30	8 „	
Joseph Henry - - -	45	13 „	
John Timperley - - -	18	6 months	
Alexander Lee - - -	28	11 years	
Alexander Caldwell - -	46	11 „	
George M'Cann - - -	27	13 „	
54 Names.			

8 April 1858.

48. Have the master calenderers pointed out to their operatives the injustice of any legislation which did not include calendering, making-up, and packing, wherever carried on?—They have.

49. In consequence of this explanation to your operatives, did the operative calender men communicate with the operative bleachers?—They thought it would be very unjust to the calenderer, if the same class of labour which was carried on in calendering, finishing, making-up and packing establishments, were omitted from the Bill, and they proposed to wait upon the operative bleachers of Bolton, and they did so; I have a paper signed by the secretary of the central committee.

50. What view did the operative bleachers of Bolton take in consequence of this communication from the operative calenderers; you have a paper, I believe?—Yes.

51. *Chairman.*] Have you any paper communicated by the operative calenderers to the operative bleachers?—Yes.

52. Mr. *Turner.*] Is that the paper which they took to Bolton?—It is a paper that was taken by Brackin, and a person of the name of Blatherwick, one of the delegates upon the Bill of 1856.

53. Did Blatherwick and Brackin take a paper to Bolton, and is that the paper?—Yes.

54. They laid it before the operative bleachers?—Yes.

55. Will you read the paper?—"We, the operative bleachers, finishers, dyers, makers-up, and packers, 'agree to the amendment of the Bleachers' Bill,' as suggested by the master calenderers of Manchester, in consequence of the reasons explained to us, and the injustice that would be done to the master calenderers of Manchester, if it did not include the same class of labour, wherever carried on, as is at the present time carried on by the master calenderers of Manchester. On behalf of the Central Committee, Bridge Inn, Bolton. *Richard Pearce*, Secretary. January 12, 1856."

56. *Chairman.*] That is not the paper taken by the calenderers to Bolton, but it is the answer of the people of Bolton to the calenderers, is it not?—It is the paper taken by two of the operative calenderers to the bleachers of Bolton. When the matter was represented to these two men, Brackin and Blatherwick, who took an active part in this matter as regarded the calenderers and finishers of Manchester, and who were in communication with the operative bleachers of Bolton, they took this paper with them, and laid it before the operative bleachers, and they signed this paper; at least, the secretary did so on behalf of the central committee.

57. Mr. *Cheetham.*] Does that paper express Brackin's opinion?—Not only the opinion of Brackin and Blatherwick, but the opinion of the operative bleachers.

58. Do they pray for legislation in the calenderers' establishment at Manchester?—In a Bill which this Committee is sitting upon, they do; this was in 1856.

59. Mr. *Turner.*] Is it the fact that that paper was prepared by the operative calender men, and taken over by Brackin and Blatherwick to see whether the operative bleachers concurred in the sentiment?—I do not think it was prepared by Brackin and Blatherwick, but they approved of it, and took it.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

H. Charlton, Esq.

15 April 1858.

60. The paper was taken and signed on behalf of the operative bleachers?—Yes.

61. Therefore I presume, by whomsoever it was prepared, it expresses their sentiments, inasmuch as they have signed it?—Yes.

62. *Chairman.*] Where did you get it from?—It was brought back by Brackin and Blatherwick, signed by the secretary of the Bleachers' Association.

63. And given to you, I suppose?—Yes.

64. Mr. *Kirk.*] How long ago?—A few days after; Saturday, I believe, was the 12th, and I think they returned with it on the Monday.

65. Mr. *Turner.*] Then I gather that the operative calenderers agree with the master calenderers that it would be unjust that they should be put under this law, unless the warehousemen who have calendering, making-up and packing going on in their establishments, are also put under the law?—They do; and I may further mention to the Committee that Brackin and Blatherwick, with Mr. Isaac Bury, a master calenderer, and myself, waited upon the late Mr. Brotherton, for the purpose of urging him to get a Bill which should include the warehouses.

66. You were urged to do that in protection of your own trade?—We were.

67. Because you were afraid of being taken into the same law along with the bleachers?—Yes, we were.

68. Do your operatives concur with you in that opinion that you should be protected by the warehousemen being put also under the same law?—They do; and not only the warehouses, but there are 35 firms in Manchester who are makers-up and packers only, and not finishers; they are makers-up and packers for hire; therefore it would be unjust to those who are calenderers and finishers if the Bill were to extend to them, and not to these 35 firms who are makers-up and packers for hire, the same as we are, as well as the warehouses.

69. Supposing this legislation were extended to warehouses, what class of warehouses should it comprise?—It would be where they employed the same labour.

70. Where calendering, making-up of any description, and packing of any description are carried on?—Yes.

71. Where would it stop; can you fix a limit where legislation would stop?—I cannot.

72. Did Mr. Tremenheere visit your works?—He did.

73. What remark did he make after inspecting them?—He went all through the works, and he said that it required no legislation for such work as was carried on in our premises.

74. And yet you do carry on the same processes as are carried on in the bleaching works and finishing departments?—Precisely the same.

75. Mr. *Cheetham.*] Have you ever been in any of the finishing departments of the bleach works?—Not at a bleach works; I have walked through bleach works.

76. From that slight inspection are you prepared to say that they are the same in the finishing and the making-up departments as yours?—In the finishing and making-up they are similar.

77. With the same heat?—No; I may mention that in our finishing-room, which is the hottest room that we have, the heat is not more than 10 degrees warmer than in the other rooms in the works, than in the making-up room, where there is no process whatever of finishing carried on. Last Thursday, Friday, Saturday and Monday the thermometer stood in our finishing-room near to the drying cylinders at 65 degrees; it was about from five to six degrees less at the other end of the room than it was near to the drying cylinders.

78. Can you tell us what it was in the finishing department of the bleach works which you went through?—No, I cannot; my attention was not drawn to it; it is some years since I went through a bleach works.

79. Mr. *Davison.*] You keep an account in your establishment, or some person under you does so, of the number of days of extra work that the men work?—Yes.

80. And the workman makes his return to that person also?—The workman makes his return to the cashier.

81. Then if any discrepancy arises between the statement of your man and of the individual making the return, it is corrected at once?—It is corrected at once, before he is paid his wages.

82. That

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

82. That is then entered in your books according to the number of hours that the man has worked, and for which he has been paid?—Yes.

83. And the extract which you have given in is a true extract from those books?—It is. I might have stated the amount of money which each man has received; I will take the first for the week commencing July the 21st: Brackin was paid for nine hours overtime; his weekly wage was 26 *s.*, and 6 *d.* per hour for overtime; every sixpence that he was paid over and above his wage represents one hour. He was paid for that week 30 *s.* 6 *d.*, so that that is nine hours overtime, 4 *s.* 6 *d.*, and it is the same throughout. The following weeks run, 24 *s.* 10 *d.*, 28 *s.* 2 *d.*, 30 *s.* 6 *d.*, 36 *s.* 6 *d.*, 35 *s.* 6 *d.*, 37 *s.*, 33 *s.* 6 *d.*, 32 *s.*, 30 *s.*, 27 *s.* 6 *d.*, 27 *s.* 6 *d.*, 31 *s.* 6 *d.*, 33 *s.* 6 *d.*, 31 *s.* 6 *d.*

84. *Chairman.*] You stated that a witness who gave a statement to the Committee last Session did that which was unfair, by not taking the whole of the year, and striking an average of hours' work throughout the year?—I think it was unfair to illustrate it in that way; if he wished to make a fair statement, he should have given the whole year.

85. Supposing persons worked a very few hours during the day for six months in the year, and a very great number of hours for the rest of the year, making in the whole ten hours and a half in the day throughout the year, still would it not be very unjust towards young persons if they should work a great number of hours in a part of the year, and would it not, in your opinion, be fair in an examination of this kind to make that statement which has been made?—In our establishment they are paid whether they have work to do or nothing. During this time if a man has not had employment for five hours in the day, but has been upon the premises, he is paid the same as if he was working ten hours a day; we make no deduction for time that they are not working; if they are on the premises, they are paid their full wage whether they work or play.

86. The object of this Committee is to ascertain whether or not young persons are employed, at any part of the year, for so large a number of hours in the day as to be injurious to them. Supposing that you work young persons a great number of hours for three months or two months in the year consecutively, and only ten hours and a half in the day throughout the rest of the year, is it not fair to give in evidence the excessive number of hours that they are worked during the two months in the year, supposing it to be so?—I have done so; I have stated that I think that the Committee might be misled by stating those hours.

87. With regard to the communication from the calenderers of Manchester to the bleachers of Bolton, I did not understand you to say that any of them are against legislation in the abstract?—There are one or two men who have signed the paper which I have read, who really are against it.

88. Altogether against it?—Altogether against it.

89. Whether you include warehouses or not?—Yes.

90. They are against the principle of legislation in such matters?—Yes.

91. That is two out of how many?—Two out of fifty-four.

92. Do they state so on the paper, or do you learn that from them privately?—One of them expressed himself so to me, and another to the person who took their names, with the time which they had worked.

93. What are their names?—Hugh M'Donald is one; he has been 21 years with us; the other is James Atkinson, who has been 38 years with us.

94. Those two men have expressed themselves as hostile to any legislation at all upon the subject?—Yes; they would rather that it was left alone.

95. Mr. *Turner.*] Perhaps another way of bringing out the fact would be by this question: is it a practice or is it not amongst the calender men of Manchester who have fulfilled their duties for the day in the main calendering establishments to hire themselves out for extra hours in the warehouses, in order to get more money?—Yes, it is quite common in busy seasons.

96. Then their own choice is to hire themselves out after they have fulfilled their hours with you?—Yes.

97. *Chairman.*] Do you allude to full-grown men, or is it young persons and females who do that as well as men?—It is men; makers-up.

98. You apply that statement merely to men?—Yes.

99. Not to young persons at all?—No; I believe that young persons practise the same thing, hookers and stitchers.

100. Do you know that that is so?—Yes, I do know that it is so.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

H. Charlton, Esq.
15 April 1858.

101. What is the occupation generally of those of whom you are now speaking?—They are hookers and stitchers who supply the makers-up with the goods in such a shape that they can make them up; the makers-up are obliged to have these hookers and stitchers; one maker-up requires two hookers and one stitcher, so that there are three young persons employed to one man.

102. When they have gone through their usual ordinary day's work, do they apply to other persons to employ them for any other part of the day?—The Operative Association urge them to do so, because such is the demand for labour in some seasons of the year that they almost compel them to go.

103. My question is, whether you can, of your own knowledge, speak to the fact, that it is habitual for them to do so?—I have four names.

104. Are those workpeople of yours?—No; they were furnished to me by Mr. Bentley.

105. You have made inquiry, and have ascertained the fact to be so, I suppose?—Yes, I have; I would not state it, unless I was perfectly convinced that what I am stating is correct. Mr. Bentley is a master calenderer and maker-up; Mr. Bentley gave me this information on Mooday. Not only Mr. Bentley, but one of the men themselves told me that he knew of not less than 20 who, in this busy season, after they had finished their regular day's work at one place, went jobbing, and that they were required to do so, because there was so much business that it could not be got through.

106. Mr. *Cheetham.*] Will you explain what you mean by saying that "they were required to do so;" who required them?—The association or club; they call them clubs; there are two clubs.

107. Mr. *Davison.*] Is that a club of the operatives?—Yes; there are two clubs of the operatives.

108. Mr. *Cheetham.*] Are the young persons compelled by the club in the same way?—I am not aware.

109. Your remark applies to adults only?—Yes.

110. *Chairman.*] You are now about to give the names of four adults, who go out after they have done their ordinary day's work?—Yes; Luke Mather, foreman at Leopold Samson's; this man worked for Mr. Bentley after he had done his own work, in the months of July and August 1857. Thomas Allport, regularly employed at Schwabe and Chamberlain's, worked in July and August, both in 1856 and 1857, at Mr. Bentley's. A man of the name of Perceval, and others at Langworthy's, worked for Mr. Bentley frequently after they had done their own work; Bamford, the secretary of No. 1 club, working at Dufay's, went to Thornton's to work at nights in August 1857, after he had finished at Dufay's.

111. Mr. *Kirk.*] In the case of a maker-up being employed in any of these warehouses, is it not necessary that he should also have with him two hookers and a stitcher?—It is.

112. In fact, whenever he is employed, there must be two hookers and a stitcher with him?—Not in all cases; if a maker-up goes to make up heavy goods, he does not require two bookers and a stitcher; it is only in the case of prints and grey goods that he requires hookers and stitchers; if they are heavy goods, they are not hooked, but they are done by the hand.

113. Mr. *Turner.*] In many of the warehouses of Manchester there are a few makers-up employed, but not very many; they do not keep a large staff?—No, not in more than one or two of the warehouses; they employ jobbers to do their work.

114. When they are pressed by extra work which their own makers-up cannot get through, what course do they adopt?—They send to the club for the jobbing makers-up, hookers, and stitchers.

115. They send to the club not only for makers-up, but for hookers and stitchers?—Yes.

116. Those hookers and stitchers must generally be supposed to be young persons, must they not?—They are.

117. Then the club does actually send both makers-up and hookers and stitchers to assist at the warehouses?—There are two distinct clubs; the hookers and stitchers have a club of their own; they are not connected in any way with the makers-up.

118. But the club does furnish hookers and stitchers to the warehouses to be employed during the extra hours of work?—Yes.

119. Are

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

H. Charlton, Esq.

15 April 1858.

119. Are not those hookers and stitchers, in many instances, employed regularly in the calender houses?—Those hookers and stitchers are employed regularly all the year round.

120. They are taught by you in the first instance generally?—Yes.

121. Then they hire themselves through the club to the warehouses, and work additional hours?—Yes.

122. *Chairman.*] Are those young persons who themselves belong to a club; do they subscribe to a club?—They do. The makers-up have two clubs, and the hookers and stitchers have two clubs; what are called the No. 1 and No. 2 of each.

123. Mr. *Turner.*] Is it not a fact, that through their clubs they are willing to do work which they complain of when they are set to do the same work by you?—At any time; all night.

124. *Chairman.*] They would forfeit something, I suppose, if they did not do what the club desired them to do?—I cannot say that; I cannot speak to it.

125. You do not know what the rules of the club are?—I do not.

126. But are you sure that young persons belong to the club; that they are subscribers to the club?—Yes.

127. When I speak of young persons, I mean persons under 18?—Yes; there are persons under 18, I believe, who are members of this club.

128. Are there any children, do you know?—No, not connected with the club.

129. Mr. *Kirk.*] Do you employ any children under 13?—We have two 12 years of age, and the other day we found that we had one of 10 years of age; but we had no knowledge of it until we were taking the ages of all the persons in our establishment. To judge from his appearance, I should say that he was 13 or 14; and my partner, Mr. John Charlton, was astonished when he told him that he was only 10 years of age, because he is as tall and as stout as a boy of 13 or 14, and we were not aware that he was only that age. He is only employed for sweeping, and if a boy is sick in the stiffening room, he minds the ends.

130. But, as a rule, you do not employ children?—We do not.

Jovis, 22° die Aprilis, 1858.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Turner.	Mr. Crook.
Colonel Forde.	Mr. Kirk.
Mr. Packe.	Mr. Davidson.
Mr. Cheetham.	Mr. Wise.

JOHN MORGAN COBBETT, Esq., IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. *Daniel Forbes*, called in; and Examined.

Mr. D. Forbes.

22 April 1858.

131. *Chairman.*] ARE you the Daniel Forbes who gave evidence before Mr. Tremenheere, the Commissioner to inquire into the question of bleaching and dyeing works in 1855?—Yes, I am.

132. Were you then engaged in any works; in what employment?—I was manager to the trustees of Patten & Brown of Pitcairn. I was manager at the field of Pitcairn.

133. What were they?—Bleachers.

134. Where?—At Pitcairn Bleach Field.

135. You remember giving evidence before the Commissioner, Mr. Tremenheere, I suppose?—Yes.

136. Now when had you gone into the service of the trustees of Patten & Brown?—On the first day of January 1855.

137. About

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

Mr. *D. Forbes.*

22 April 1858.

137. About what time was it that you gave your evidence; do you remember?—I could not speak to that.

138. But you were in that employment at the time that you gave your evidence?—Yes, I was in their employment at that time.

139. And when did you quit that situation?—I left that situation in April 1856.

140. Then from January 1855 to April 1856 you were in the employment of those trustees whom you have named?—Yes.

141. Now your evidence has been attacked before this Committee by Mr. Bowley. Have you read that evidence?—Yes.

142. This question and answer were given, amongst others: "Are you aware that Mr. Daniel Forbes has lost three situations in a very short time?" The answer is, "I have been so informed on good authority." Now is it true that you lost three situations in a very short time?—No.

143. Now I will go back to the time when you were first employed in any bleach field; what was the name of it?—Laucretie Bleach Field; that was the first I was employed at.

144. What was the name of the firm?—Messrs. Marshall, Sandeman, & Co.

145. What year did you go into their employment?—In the year 1830.

146. And when did you leave them?—I left them in 1836.

147. Was that for the purpose of going into any other employment of the same kind?—Yes; I engaged to go with Messrs. Turnbull & Co., of Claverhouse Bleach Field, to be manager to them.

148. Were you invited by them to go into their service, or did you go and apply for it?—No; I applied for the situation.

149. Why did you leave the employment of Messrs. Marshall & Sandeman?—I got better encouragement. I got more wages than I had from Marshall, Sandeman, & Co., to go there.

150. You got from Turnbull & Co. better wages than you got from Marshall & Sandeman?—Yes.

151. Did you give your employers regular notice to quit?—Yes, I gave them in warning.

152. Therefore you were not dismissed?—No; I gave in my warning, and wrought till the day.

153. You quitted your employment to get a better situation?—Yes, I did.

154. How long did you stay with Turnbull & Co.?—Till November 1838.

155. Were you dismissed from their employment?—No.

156. Did you go away, giving them warning?—I gave them in my warning, and went back to the same company again.

157. You went back to Marshall, Sandeman & Co.?—Yes, I was asked back by Mr. Marshall himself. He asked me to come back to him again, and I engaged with him.

158. Did he give you the same wages that you got from Turnbull & Co., or not?—I got more from him.

159. He offered you more wages than you got at Messrs. Turnbull's?—Yes.

160. And therefore you quitted Turnbull's?—Yes; and went back to him.

161. So that you appear to have improved your condition at each of these moves?—Yes.

162. How long then, from 1838, did you remain with Marshall, Sandeman & Co. again?—Till March 1850.

163. Did you then leave them?—Yes.

164. Of your own account?—Yes, of my own accord.

165. Giving them notice?—I gave them notice.

166. And they gave you no notice?—I got no notice from them. I gave in my notice.

167. And where did you go to then?—I went with Mackenzie & Ramsey at Deanfield.

168. Till what time did you remain with them?—I remained with them till the spring of 1853.

169. In the spring of 1853 did your brothers come to you and induce you to leave Mackenzie & Ramsey?—Yes.

170. Mackenzie & Ramsey did not give you any notice to quit them, did they?—None.

171. But you quitted them in fact at the solicitation of your brothers?—Yes.

172. And

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

172. And in fact you were not discharged at all?—I was not discharged.

173. Now, did you remain out of employment for some time; and did you then go to Pitcairn Field?—Yes, I for a time did nothing. Then I bought in the town of Perth the Alloa Ale Stores, in Mill-street, and I kept them for a little time, and finding that they were not a proper place for me to be in, I sold the whole off at a sacrifice, and went back to Laucretie again. I took a shop there, and in January 1855 I was asked to go to Pitcairn Field by the trustees of Patten & Brown to take charge of their field.

174. And did you go?—I did so, and remained till the firm broke up and sold off the whole.

175. When was that?—In 1856.

176. It was in April 1856?—In April 1856.

177. Who are the trustees of the Pitcairn Field?—The Rev. Mr. Liston, the parochial minister, and Mr. Wilson, the parochial teacher.

178. Who was he that asked you to go back to Pitcairn Field?—The whole of them asked me. They sent the present manager to me. They sent the manager to me to see if I would go. There was a manager there, and had been for some years previous, and he was there for a little time after I left, and he came. The trustees asked me, as the place was not doing very well, if I would go and make any improvement upon it, and I did so at their request.

179. You went there in the year 1855, and remained there till April 1856?—Yes, the 1st of April.

180. When the whole concern was broken up?—Yes.

181. And that I suppose discharged you as well as the rest of the workpeople?—The whole of the workpeople were idle at the time; but there was another party who took the field, and put it in order.

182. But you quitted them at that time?—Yes.

183. From that time, 1856 to 1857, I believe you were doing nothing?—No, I did nothing; very little.

184. You did not engage with any master?—No master.

185. In 1857 did you go into anybody's employ?—Yes, I went into Provost Ewen's, of Dundee, employ.

186. At what time of 1857, do you remember?—In the month of January.

187. How long did you stay with him?—I stayed with him till his failure.

188. How long ago is that?—I cannot say that.

189. Two or three months ago, perhaps?—Three months ago, I should say. I could not say as to the correct date; but about that time I should think it was.

190. He never discharged you, I believe?—No, he never discharged me.

191. Are you engaged with any person at the present moment?—I went there with Messrs. Edwards, where I am at present.

192. As what?—As inspector of the power-loom factory.

193. That carries you through the various employments from 1830 to 1857, during which time you appear to have lived with several masters. Were you ever dismissed by any one of them?—Not one.

194. I must now call your attention to this question and answer, which are contained in page 179 of the first Report of the Committee that sat last Session: "Do you know why he was dismissed from any of his situations?" alluding to you. The answer is, "Three years before this inquiry I was informed that he was dismissed from L—— bleaching field." The name is not given, but simply the letter L.?—It is Laucretie bleaching field.

195. Is there any other bleaching field, the name of which begins with L., except Laucretie?—No; one was Pitcairn Field, the other Deoo Field, and the other Claverhouse.

196. Then it is untrue to say that you were dismissed from Laucretie?—Quite untrue.

197. Or from any of the other places?—Yes.

198. You remember, I suppose, the nature of the evidence you gave to Mr. Tremenheere?—Yes.

199. And I suppose you have read the reports that have been made from time to time to the House from this Committee and the Committee that sat last year?—Yes.

200. Do you see any reason whatever to alter anything that you stated to Mr. Tremenheere, or do you stand by it now?—I stood by the same.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

Mr. D. Forbes.
22 April 1858.

201. Have you had opportunities of conversing with any persons in your class in Scotland with regard to that matter?—Yes.

202. Do you find that anybody objects to your evidence as being untrue in any particular?—Not one.

203. Do you or do you not think that the greater part of those of your own class would support you in your evidence, and in your views as to the remedy to be applied?—Yes.

204. Do you think that there is a general feeling in favour of legislative interference in order to stay the long hours that we have heard spoken of?—Yes, that is the general feeling among the operatives.

205. Mr. *Packe.*] What situation did you fill under the firm that employed you in 1830, Messrs. Marshall, Sandeman & Co.?—When I went in 1830 I had charge of the beetling, and I went to the office two days in the week with himself.

206. Did you fill a higher situation in 1836, the next situation that you filled?—Yes; I was sole manager at Claverhouse then.

207. That was a better, a higher situation than the one that you held in 1830?—Yes.

208. Mr. *Turner.*] What age were you in 1830?—Fourteen.

209. Could you have charge of the beetling at that time?—Yes, I took charge of the beetles. I was put by Mr. Marshall, at that age, to take charge of the finishing and beetling.

210. Mr. *Kirk.*] Are the hours employed in beetling longer or shorter than those employed in other departments of the bleaching?—Yes.

211. Has your evidence reference principally to beetling?—No, I refer to bleaching, as well as beetling.

212. Now you say that you became sole manager to another company?—Yes, in the cloth department.

213. Will you explain what you mean by being sole manager in the cloth department?—I had sole charge of the bleaching and finishing of the works at the field; superintending the paying of the servants, and all that.

214. How did you manage to acquire a knowledge of the bleaching, when you were so closely occupied superintending the beetling?—I was doing all I could to learn; and wherever I could find knowledge I was storing it up in my mind; and by some good friend that I had, I got a pretty good practice; and Mr. Marshall was every day labouring with me; he taught me to be a bleacher; he began with me when I was very young, and gave me all the assistance he could.

215. You stated for a fact that, at the early age of 14 years, Mr. Marshall gave you the sole charge of the finishing of the linen goods?—The charge of the beetling.

216. That is not the finishing?—The charge of the beetling; that is what I say, I am beetler.

217. I know what you mean by it; but are not the beetling and finishing synonymous?—I had charge of the beetling, to see that they did their work, and were all regularly there, and that they shifted their beams, and attended to all those things; the finishing I did not attend to at that age; the finishing of the goods I did not attend to.

218. You were merely set there to see that the people came at their proper hours, and shifted the beams at the proper time?—Yes, and did all the work that I was ordered to do; but I had nothing to do with the finishing; Mr. Marshall attended to whether the goods were well finished or not.

219. Now, you say that you left Mackintosh & Co.'s in 1853, at the solicitation of your brothers?—Yes.

220. How were you occupied from that time to January 1855?—I did nothing for a few weeks after I left Mackintosh & Ramsey; and I bought the Alloa Ale Stores; it belonged to one Mr. Bald, in the town of Perth. I carried that on for a little time, and finding that it was a thing that I was not to do well into, I sold it off, and went back to the neighbourhood of Laucretie, and I took up a shop there.

221. Were those ale stores a wholesale or a retail concern?—It was a wholesale concern; I had no retail, further than going to private families. There was no drinking in the place; it was all carried out; I kept a cart for that purpose; I had a cart that went through the country with it.

222. How were you occupied from April 1856 to January 1857?—I went with the trustees

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

Mr. *D. Forbes.*

22 April 1858.

trustees of Patten and Brown in 1855, and I left them in April 1856; then I came into the town of Perth. I removed my family there, and commenced a washing and dressing establishment. I took up a place, and lived at it for twelve months, and began to wash and dress clothes, and I erected the things that were necessary for it; and after I had done all, and spent a good deal of money, I found that I could not get business enough to keep me, and I relinquished it; I sold all off, and came to Dundee in search of employment, and I got in with Provost Ewen, as clerk and warehouseman to him.

223. And you are now employed as superintendent in a power-loom factory?—Yes; I am cloth inspector in the power-loom factory of Messrs. Edwards of Dundee.

224. What do you mean by cloth inspector?—I mean that every piece of goods I have to examine to see that that piece of cloth be really the quality that it should be; and I have to see that it is prnperly manufactured, and everything else attending it.

225. Mr. *Turner.*] What wages have you for that occupation?—I have just 18*s.* at present, but I have a promise of more; that is all the wages I have received.

226. You mean 18*s.* per week?—Yes.

227. That is a poor wage for a clothmaker?—I have that to begin with; it was a new thing to me, and they were not sure whether I would manage very well with it.

228. It is not a very high situation, is it?—It is a responsible situation; I might injure them a good deal if I were to neglect my duties under it.

229. Mr. *Cheetham.*] How many years after you were brought to the heetle did you become the sole manager at the works that you have spoken of?—Five years when I left Laucretie.

230. What year was it in which you were put to heetling?—In 1830.

231. And what year was it of which you spoke of being manager?—I went in 1836 to Claverhouse.

232. It is there you were manager?—Yes.

233. Mr. *Turner.*] I asked you a question as to your present wages; what were the highest wages you had when you were manager?—£. 108.

234. *Chairman.*] Had any of the other firms that you were employed under failed in business, excepting the one that you have mentioned?—Mackintosh, Ramsey & Co. have now failed, but they had not failed when I left.

235. You were not thrown out of employment by the failure of anybody?—None but Pitcairn.

236. You have been asked how you became acquainted with the operation of beetling, you being a bleacher; are those operations carried on in the same establishment?—In the same establishment; they are quite separate things for all that.

237. Are the two operations carried on under the same roof?—No; beetling is quite in a place by itself.

238. In a separate place?—In a separate place.

239. Do you know the present state of the bleaching works in Scotland, compared to what they were when you entered them 25 years ago. The work carried on, and the number of hours?—They are much the same. There is very little difference as regards the hours that there was when I first became a bleacher.

240. Is it mostly out-door bleaching?—Out and in.

241. Both?—Both.

242. Is there any change in the process now in-doors?—There is a change now. There is a change as regards the mode of bleaching; but as regards the hours, there is very little change in that; I mean as regards the length of hours.

243. Does that mode tell more or less against the workmen?—It should make very little difference to the workmen; only their hands are destroyed, as it is with lime. Bleaching destroys their hands more than it did in the old times. As to the labour, it is rather worse.

244. Part of your evidence before Mr. Tremenheere was relating to the effects of the long hours of work upon young persons, and you say they are generally so tired that if they sit down they are asleep in a minute. Do you mean that you have observed yourself that they are so tired that they sit down and go to sleep immediately after fatigue?—Many times, even at their work, I have come upon them sleeping.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

Mr. *D Forbes.*
22 April 1858.

245. When they have been employed?—When they have been employed throughout the day. I have come upon them standing sleeping beside their work, leaning over a pile of cloth, often and again, through fatigue and exhaustion of the body, just for want of rest.

246. You mean that that is not a single occasion on which you have seen such a thing?—Nn, not a single occasion.

247. Do you mean that you have frequently seen it?—I have seen it frequently.

248. I understand you tn say tbat you stand hy the evidence tbat you gave to Mr. Tremenheere in that particular as well as otbers?—Yes.

249. Mr. *Kirk.*] Tu what class of persons does tbat observation apply?—I have seen it at the drying cans; I have come upon them at the drying cans. It is wnmen who are employed there; young women. There is one man that takes charge of the drying, but the women do all the work almost, and they have tn stand at the end of the form. They are dried by cans heated with steam, and when they have been opening the selvidges of the pieces I have seen them fall asleep, and take the piece with them. I nnce saw a woman tear the piece in two when she was asleep at her work.

250. Is not that very light labour, attending to the drying cans?—The labour is not so very hard; but it is the length of time that they have to stand upon their feet; they get so worn out. It is not so very heavy work if it were only for eight or ten hours.

251. In what way do you apply the cloth to the steam cans?—The cloth is put over the cans.

252. How do you begin?—It is with a piece of twine at first that is attached to the end of the piece of clnth, and then there are eight below and seven cans up. The string twines up through them till it gets out nf the other end. When the first piece is dry, the women attach with pins the next piece; and it goes on that way the whole day.

253. Is the piece not put upon a roller, in the first instance, to feed the can?—No.

254. What is the last process?—The blueing.

255. How is it blued?—Some do it with ultramarine; others with indigo.

256. But after it is bleached?—When it is full white, it is then put into a large vat where the blue is made up, the liquid. The piece is put in there, and it is driven through this by a windlass till it is properly blued; till it is all blued alike. Then it is taken and run out of this as dry as they can make it. Then the women draw it up to its breadth, and it is taken to the cans after that.

Mr. *Duncan Feargus Forbes,* called in; and Examined.

Mr. *D. F. Forbes.*

257. *Chairman.*] WHAT are you?—A millwright.

258. Where do you live?—In Huntingtower Bleach Works.

259. Whereabouts is that?—Four miles north from Perth.

260. How long have you been engaged in that business?—Upwards of 20 or 23 years.

261. Now, does that bring you much acquainted with the bleach works and dye works in that district?—Yes; I have been principal mechanic in two of the largest bleach fields in the north of Scotland for 20 years past; I was 13 years with Mr. Marshall, the firm which has been spoken of to-day.

262. What Marshall is that?—Marshall, Sandeman & Co.

263. How many years?—About 13 years as principal mechanic; but I was there some years before.

264. Your brother was also at Marshall & Sandeman's?—Yes.

265. During the whole of the time that we have been speaking of, from 1830 down to 1857, you have been intimately acquainted with your brother, I suppose, and his occupations?—Oh, perfectly.

266. Did you ever hear of his being dismissed from any place; have you the least idea that there is any truth in the insinuation that he was dismissed from any nf his situations?—No.

267. Now, you are acquainted, I suppose, with the class of people to which he belongs, the working people, the operatives?—Perfectly.

268. In bleaching and dyeing works?—Yes; I have a perfect knowledge of all.

269. And

Pnnted image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

269. And have associated with them, I suppose?—Yes.

270. Now, can you speak at all as to the matter of the long hours of work imposed upon young persons, that is, people under 18 years of age, and women, in these works?—Yes.

271. Is it your opinion or not that they work too many hours?—Oh, decidedly.

272. Now, is that the general opinion of those working people?—Of all the intelligent class it is.

273. What hours do you know of their working? There was one place, Pitcairn Field, that your brother gave evidence upon before Mr. Tremenheere; do you know the hours there?—May I be allowed to go back a considerable time?

274. If it throws any light upon the present case?—When a young boy I have wrought myself from two o'clock in the morning till sometimes eight and nine.

275. How old were you then?—About 15.

276. Where were you at work then?—At Laucretie Bleach Works.

277. What labour was that?—At pinning and linking.

278. Now, just say what you know?—The females rose and the young boys about two o'clock in the morning, to what they call linking: those who know anything about bleach works, know what is meant by that: they continue at that till five and six.

279. It is working at the bleach works?—Yes, linking, that is in-door work, till five or half-past five or six, according to the amount of work they have to do. Then they commence their day's work at six, and sometimes (not always, but frequently) they will be at what they call a quarter night after their day's work is done, which may keep them sometimes till seven, sometimes till eight o'clock, according as to the cloth to sum out.

280. This is a part of your brother's evidence: "Our regular hours of work are from 2 a. m. to eight at night; this is in the bleaching, and they go on without stopping, except two hours for meals"?—I think that has a reference to drying can work; I am speaking of bleach work.

281. He says, "In this department we have five females; but we are not able always to get them up at that hour, they are so tired. In the other, the beetling mills, we have 10 women, who go on from 6 to 10, and every other night from 6 a. m. to 6 a. m. the next morning, except that they rest from 10 p. m. till 2 a. m., and then it takes them sometimes an hour or less to shift their beetling beams; then they lie down on the boards again till five in the morning, and go on the same way; therefore, every alternate night they get home to go to bed from 10 p. m. to 5 a. m.;" this is in the bleaching?—Yes.

282. Do you know anything about that?—Yes; it is quite true with regard to the cans.

283. Now, do you know anything about the effects of the long hours of work upon women and children?—It has a tendency to weaken their health very much.

284. Do you know that it does so; have you observed it?—I see it from the effects it has upon them. There is a sluggishness about them; for instance, if they were sitting down to read, there would not be many minutes when they would be over, or the book would be tumbling down before them; or were one to read half a column of a newspaper, it might set half a dozen or many more asleep.

285. That is when they come home from their work?—That is in their meal hours.

286. Now, do you know whether the attack upon your brother in that evidence has been noticed by any body of the people at Pitcairn Field?—Yes, I think the workers that were there during his time have taken notice of it.

287. Did you ever see this document: this is a newspaper (*calling the attention of the Witness to an article headed "Bleaching and Dye Works Bill, Pitcairn Field, 10th March 1858"*?—Yes.

288. Did you observe that that was published throughout the neighbourhood?—Yes.

289. Do you know whose names are attached to this?—Yes, I know every one of them.

290. Does this, then, express the feeling generally of the working people with regard to this question?—Yes, at Pitcairn it does.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

Mr. D. F. Forbes.

22 April 1858.

291. Those who have read it?—Yes.

292. Perhaps you will be good enough to hand it in?—Yes.

[*The Witness handed in the following document.*]

Bleaching and Dye Works Bill.

Pitcairn Field, 10 March 1858.

The evidence of Daniel Forbes, given before Her Majesty's Commissioner, Hugh S. Tremenheere, having been unjustly impugned before the Select Committee of the House of Commons by Henry S. Boase, of Claverhouse, in reply to interrogatories by Mr. Baxter, the Member for Montrose, we, the undersigned workers at Pitcairn Field, hereby declare, from experience and observation, that the evidence of D. Forbes is truthful and honest. He stated, "The regular hours of work are from 2 a. m. to 8 at night; this is in the bleaching; and they go on without stopping, except two hours for meals." These were the regular hours; but we can prove that bleachers, male and female, in many instances wrought from 2 a. m. to 10 at night, being 18 hours' labour per day; while females employed at steam-drying (an unhealthy occupation) have for months followed machinery, day after day, for 16, often 18, and sometimes 20 hours per day, and occasionally for 40 hours without intermission, meal hours excepted, all the vigilance of the man in charge being ineffectual in preventing these females from sleeping at their work. We have also known females so employed, after going home to supper at 10 p. m. or later, necessitated to return and sleep on the premises where they wrought, because the night watchman could not rouse them from their slumbers to resume work at 2 a. m. if they went to bed at home.

Further, we affirm that all the operatives in this locality with whom we have conversed on the subject have expressed concurrence in the truthfulness of D. Forbes's evidence as being applicable to the majority of bleach works in this neighbourhood when trade is brisk, and regret is felt that he should have suffered censure or reproach for doing what an honest man could not avoid, when the integrity of his statement can be incontrovertibly established by so many who have felt the direful and blighting effects of excessive overtime in prostrating the physical powers, and preventing moral and mental improvement.

It is not true that D. Forbes was dismissed from Pitcairn Field. Our late employers, Messrs. Patten & Brown, retired from the field and the trade in 1856, and, being their manager, his connexion with Pitcairn Field terminated at that time.

The evidence of Mr. Boase is altogether at variance with our experience of bleach field work. The beetlers have to wash covers and cloth, damp, prepare, carry,—in some cases long distances—stretch or crisp the cloth they finish, a single operation occupying in many instances three or four hours, and all is done between shiftings; and, in addition, they have to spend two or three nights per week on the "boards," as stated by D. Forbes; and we leave it to impartial medical men to decide if labour protracted to the furthest verge of human endurance, and day and night systematically conjoined, can be conducive to physical health or moral improvement. We say that these unnatural conditions are only submitted to from the fact that we have less remuneration for 10 hours' labour than any class of operatives in the United Kingdom. Partial amelioritions have been granted of late, but we question if ever the Perthshire bleachers will reach the point indicated by Mr. Boase, namely, "obtain all that is reasonable" without Legislative enactment and supervision.

John Robertson,	*John Scott.*
James Henderson.	*William Murray.*
John Forbes.	*Catherine Richardson.*
William Kinloch.	*Helen Turner.*
James Wilkie.	*Ann Pearson.*
William M'Raw.	*Jean Brechin.*
Thomas Robertson.	*Jean Anderson.*
John Anderson.	*John Rutherford.*
William Christie.	*Betsy Miller.*
Samuel M'Raw.	*Mary Robertson.*
David M'Donald.	*Amelia Dawson.*
Henry Wilkie.	

being the operatives employed under Daniel Forbes, still at Pitcairn Field."

I may state, that the place I am employed in just now is Mr. Turnbull's, at Huntingtower.

293. Is that the Mr. Turnbull of whom your brother has spoken?—No; it is a bleacher near Perth.

294. What is it that you wish to state to the Committee?—That he has shortened the hours. He does all his work within the 10 hours; that is, all his wet works, and his drying cans, and his calender work within the 10 hours; and I believe, were he to attempt to reimpose the old hours, he would have very great difficulty in doing it. He has done this for two years.

295. Do you mean that he has not exceeded the 10 hours a day for two years?—Yes.

296. Mr.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

296. Mr. *Cheetham.*] Where is that place?—At Huntingtower, near Perth.

297. You say that he has done this for two years?—Yes.

298. It has been an arrangement between him and his workpeople?—Yes; he has erected new works, and he finds that he can accommodate his work in that space of time.

299. Is it an arrangement which is satisfactory to all parties?—Yes.

300. And it is done without the aid of legislation?—Yes.

301. *Chairman.*] So that, if every other master would do the same, there would be no necessity for legislation?—But you would not be able to get every master to do that.

302. Mr. *Cheetham.*] You say that you have known your brother many years in his various occupations?—Yes.

303. Has he ever been charged with being a tipsy, drunken man?—Only when in Deanfield.

304. Who was his employer there?—Ramsay, Mackenzie & Co.

305. That was in the year 1853, was it not?—He left in 1853; it was in the close of 1853.

306. Was that the cause of his leaving?—It was the cause of my taking him away.

307. Mr. *Kirk.*] What was the name of the place where you say they were at work at very long hours, from two in the morning till eight at night?—At Laucretie.

308. Is that within four miles of Perth?—Yes, four miles or four miles and a half.

309. Is there any other employment in the neighbourhood, except at these bleach works?—There are other labouring works through the country, but not much public works till you get to Stanley.

310. Had the proprietor of these works much difficulty in procuring persons to work these long hours?—They are brought up in the neighbourhood, and stick to the place themselves.

311. But could not these people have left the works if they chose?—Yes, decidedly, but their mind is so oppressed with labour that they are afraid, many of them, even to mention their wrongs.

312. How long did you work the long hours yourself?—Two years. I was two years at the bleaching, and two years as a beetle-man.

313. What number of hours per day or per week have you been in the habit of working since?—In what department?

314. Generally?—I work 10 hours.

315. I cannot perceive any important difference in your health and constitution and that of your brother in the long hours?—My brother did not work long hours; he was always an idle man in his departments. I mean that he was not a man putting his hand to labour.

316. You do not mean idle in the offensive term?—No, I mean putting his hand to overseeing others.

317. He was a man that overlooked, rather than did the actual work himself?—Yes.

318. Mr. *Kirk.*] Will you explain to the Committee, because we rather stumble over it, how it is that he is willing to accept 18*s.* a week now, or something under 50*l.* a year, when he ought to be advancing in his profession as a foreman bleacher, and getting 120*l.* or 150*l.* a year?—He has not got into any of the fields since I took him away from Deanfield.

319. But is there any special reason for that?—His falling out of that situation as a bleacher since I took him away.

320. That is Mackenzie, Ramsay & Co., the last situation he was in?—Yes.

321. Why did he fall out of that situation?—I took him away from it.

322. Was not that the place where he was accused of an inclination to drink; was he not accused of being rather too fond of his glass?—Yes, I think I stated that.

323. And you thought it better that he should come away from there?—Yes, for the bad influence it would have upon others.

324. Do you think that the knowledge of that fact had any influence in preventing his being again employed in a similar situation?—You are as well aware as I am that situations of that sort seldom pass up.

325. No, I am not aware of that; I do not know any man so much wanted as

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

Mr. *D. F. Forbes.*

22 April 1858.

a good foreman bleacher?—He knows the bleaching quite well, which I can state and prove.

326. *Chairman.*] I understood that your brother left Mackenzie, Ramsay & Co. in 1853?—Yes.

327. You are asked how it is that he never got into any bleach-field again; what was Pitcairn field where he went in 1855?—It was a bleach-field too.

328. He went there in 1855?—Yes.

329. So that he did get into another bleach-field after he left Mackenzie, Ramsay, & Co.?—Yes.

330. Do you know whether they contemplated breaking up the establishmeot when he went into their employment?—Not when he went into it.

331. Now about the glass. You say, I think, that you went to Mackenzie & Co. and took him away in 1853?—Yes.

332. Now did you go and induce him to go away with you, or did they dismiss him?—He was not dismissed; I took him away.

333. Supposing, then, that he had given way to the habit of taking too much drink, had they dismissed him on that account; had that done him any harm with his masters?—No.

334. They did not dismiss him on that account?—No.

335. They did not dismiss him at all, then?—No; I took him away.

336. I want to know how far you were living from Mackenzie's, the place you took him from, at that time?—About 30 miles, perhaps.

337. Had you heard that he was getting into this state, and did you think it better that he should quit the place, and therefore go for him?—His mistress wrote to me; it was at her earnest suggestion that I took him away.

338. Was it the habit of the people at that place to drink too much; had you heard that?—There were a few that I heard liked a little drop, and some of those who should have done it did not set them a good example.

339. And therefore you thought it was better that he should come away from that place?—Decidedly. I may also state, that I went to Mr. Mackenzie when he went away.

340. That is one of the partners?—Yes; Ramsay and Mackenzie reside at Dundee; I told them what I had done.

341. You told them that you had taken your brother away?—Yes, and they said that they would settle with me for his wages. They said that they would pay up his account, but that being past bank hours, I might call again. I called again, and Mr. Mackenzie said that there was some cloth damaged, and that they would not pay his wages, and he has not paid them; and I stated to him that the cloth had been damaged since he left. I told him I could prove that that was the case; but, however, he did not pay, and has not done it.

342. Mr. *Turner.*] He received then about 108 *l.* a year salary when he was dismissed; he said that that was the most he received at the time that you took him away, thinking that he was getting into rather irregular ways?—Yes.

343. That was very kind of you. Afterwards he went into the beer trade, did he not?—Yes.

344. And he found that that did not answer, and then he kept a shop?—Yes.

345. And it was two years afterwards, in 1855, that he went to a fifth situation?—Yes.

346. What wages did he receive when he went into that situation?—I do not know; I cannot answer that question.

347. You do not know that?—No, I cannot tell.

348. I want to know his history; I want to know his estimation, after he left his situation of 120 *l.* a year, by his employer. He remained in that situation a year; and then for another year, 1856 to 1857, he did nothing?—No.

349. That is his own account?—Yes.

350. From 1857 to January 1858 he went into a sixth situation?—Yes.

351. Was that a bleach-field?—That was at a spinning factory, a manufactory.

352. I thought that was afterwards, in 1858?—They were both factories.

353. Do you know what his wages were then?—No.

354. Altogether unconnected with bleaching?—I could not state his wages.

355. In 1858 he went to another firm, and he is now in that firm, as an overlooker of cloth, at 18*s.* a week?—Yes.

356. Mr. *Cheetham.*] In 1853 he left Deanfield?—Yes.

357. To

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

357. To whom did he go then; to his brother's?—His brother-in-law's.

358. What employment was that?—Doing nothing; he went to reside with him.

359. And how long did he remain there?—Well, I cannot positively say.

360. Then he went to Perth?—Yes.

361. What was he doing at Perth?—He went to try to do something in the bleaching of cloths.

362. Mr. *Kirk.*] Are we to understand that from the time your brother left Mackenzie & Co.'s employment, in 1853, or that you induced him to leave that employment, that he has not been employed as a foreman bleacher since?—He was at Pitcairn bleach works since that time.

363. That was from 1855 to 1856?—Yes.

364. That was a bleach work?—Yes, a linen bleach work.

365. What situation was he in there?—He was foreman bleacher there under the trustees. I would wish to answer another question with respect to linen beetling if it is consistent with the business of the Committee.

366. What is it?—It is with respect to Mr. Bowley's statement.

367. What is it about?—It is about beetling cloth; he says the beetlers beetle sheets every four hours, and they do nothing else but take the cloth off the beam.

368. *Chairman.*] With their finger?—Yes; which a child may do. At one of the principal fields where I was at they did it at 6, at 9, at 12, at 3, at 6, at 11, and at 2.

369. Mr. *Turner.*] Are you speaking of the hours as a bleacher, as a practical man?—Yes; I have wrought at the beetles, I have made them, and I know how to work them. When they are finishing the sheeting the first turn is every 20 minutes.

370. They must shift oftener?—They must shift in the course of 20 minutes. Mr. Bowley's statement was once in four hours; he said that they had nothing else but to sit and wait till that was done, and that a child might do it. These sheetings have to be stretched, and they have to be stricken, an operation which it will take a strong man to throw a couple of hundred weight over his head.

371. Mr. Bowley said they can rest once in four hours?—Yes, and that they rest until the beams are filled.

372. How long do you say they rest?—Once in every three hours, and once a day they have crisping and striking and cloth washing all to do in intervals.

373. Mr. *Cheetham.*] You say that Mr. Bowley in his evidence in that respect is incorrect?—Yes.

374. Do you know his evidence?—Yes.

375. You say that his statement of his own work is not correct?—I cannot say his own work, but he refers to bleach-fields near Perth.

376. *Chairman.*] You are acquainted with the bleach-fields about Perth?—Yes.

377. Mr. *Crook.*] Does he refer to his own establishment or to bleach-fields generally?—He says it refers to bleach-fields north of Perth.

378. *Chairman.*] Had your brother saved any money when he went into the ale business?—Yes.

379. Enough to open that business?—Yes, and a good deal more.

380. Mr. *Kirk.*] How long are these people occupied in stripping and filling the beetling beams?—Will you state the kind of cloth you want to know.

381. I will say a piece of 40 inches wide and 60 yards long?—There will perhaps be one or two beams, but there are always two at a time.

382. I want you to tell me what time these people are occupied?—They are occupied about 20 minutes in filling a beam of the state you speak of.

383. Is the beam turned by machinery?—Yes, in one or two places. Some of the masters prefer having beams where boys are employed turning, that they may have them to be put in as beamers.

384. How many beams does each workman fill at each change?—Two.

385. He is occupied for 40 minutes then every four hours?—I did not say so. I said the shiftings were once in three hours, and sometimes once in 20 minutes. When they put them on at first it is every 20 minutes; the second time they give them longer turns. It is only in the latter stages that they give them the long turns.

386. But there are stages in the process in which they are employed 40 minutes every three hours or 40 minutes every four hours, as the case may be?—They are employed nearly all the forenoon.

387. Answer the question, aye or no; I will not have any hedging off. Are

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

Mr. *D. F. Forbes.*
22 April 1858.

there stages or not?—Yes, there are stages: but they do not rest these four hours during these stages. They have other cloth to prepare for the next set coming on.

388. Do the persons who attend the beetling beams prepare the cloth before they put them on?—Yes.

389. They are not prepared for them, then?—No.

390. There is no distinct set of persons to prepare them?—In some fields they have a partial preparation; not in all.

391. Are you prepared to state whether there are separate persons to prepare them in Mr. Bowley's firm?—I cannot say.

392. Is it unlikely that there are?—I cannot say. I only speak what I do know.

393. Mr. *Turner.*] You are not likely to know so well as Mr. Bowley himself?—I know about Perth much better than he does.

394. Are you likely to know his work better than he is himself?—I am every day amongst them.

395. Are you likely to be so well acquainted with the operations going on in Mr. Bowley's works as Mr. Bowley himself is?—No; I know nothing about them; I have never pretended to know anything about them.

396. Mr. *Kirk.*] Of how many concerns do you actually know the working?—I can speak of two that I have been employed in the last 20 years; I can speak to those two.

397. And do you mean to state that, at the present time, in those two concerns, the persons who attend the beetles prepare the goods for them?—One of them, I believe, does partially; sheetings, I believe.

398. But you are not aware that the cloths, in the best regulated concerns, are prepared for the beetles?—No; it is not in the neighbourhood of Perth.

399. Not anywhere in the neighbourhood of Perth?—Not anywhere in the neighbourhood of Perth.

400. *Chairman.*] Do you wish to make any explanation upon that?—Yes.

401. Do so?—I said that sometimes sheetings were prepared, but no other cloths are prepared.

402. You have been asked by an honourable Member how many concerns you know the management of, and you say two, and that you are perfectly acquainted with the management of two?—Yes,

403. Have you any means of knowing the mode of management in other concerns, though you have not been employed in them. For instance, you meet your fellow-workmen, and do you converse with them upon these subjects?—Yes; I am thoroughly acquainted with all the fields in the neighbourhood of Perth.

404. Does your business as a millwright take you through them?—I am on friendly terms with them, and can go there when I like.

405. Therefore of two you have a perfect knowledge, because you have worked in them yourself?—Yes.

406. And of the rest I understand you have a general knowledge that you have acquired in associating with your brother workpeople, and so on?—Yes; Mr. Sandeman has beetling machines, and he does not need preparations. I think that may be satisfactory there; and none of the rest of the field has. Mr. Turnhull is erecting them, and has been for some time; but in other parts they are not ready yet.

Mr. *Henry Wilkie*, called in; and Examined.

Mr. *H. Wilkie.*

407. *Chairman.*] WHAT are you?—Beetler.

408. Where do you live?—Bridgetown.

409. Is that near Perth?—That is about four miles from Perth; rather more.

410. Who is your employer?—Mr. Lumsley, at Pitcairn-field, at present.

411. Is that the place where Mr. Forbes works?—Yes.

412. Is that Patten and Brown's?—Yes; I was there at the time that Daniel Forbes was their manager. He was first their foreman bleacher, as stated by his brother; but latterly he had the sole management of the work, until they left in 1856.

413. I understand that the trustees wound up the concern?—Yes.

414. Who took the concern after them?—David Lumsley.

415. Your

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

415. Your employer?—Yes.

416. And how long have you worked in that field?—I have worked there about 10 years.

417. Had you known Mr. Daniel Forbes before?—No; I was not intimately acquainted with him before he became manager.

418. You know probably whether there was any misunderstanding between him and the trustees during the time he was there?—I never heard of any.

419. But he left when they wound the concern up?—Yes; I never understood that he was dismissed.

420. Have you had occasion to read the evidence given by Mr. Bowley before this Committee last year?—Yes.

421. Was that evidence discussed among you and the other workpeople of your class?—Yes.

422. In your neighbourhood?—Yes; among a certain number. I may state that a good number do not know Mr. Bowley's evidence so far as I am aware, but wherever it was known it was discussed, and great indignation was expressed in consequence.

423. To what part of the evidence do you allude?—In consequence of its being generally inapplicable to the bleach-field of Perthshire. He stated that his evidence referred to the whole of the bleach-fields in the east of Scotland.

424. You think that his evidence was incorrect?—Yes.

425. I wish to know whether you have heard of the discussion among your class as to the attack that was made upon Mr. Daniel Forbes by Mr. Bowley?—At what time?

426. The evidence was given by Mr. Bowley in the last Session of Parliament, I suppose you saw the report?—No; I never saw the report. Mr. Bowley's evidence we saw when it was published in the evening papers, I think about the beginning of this year; but I find that by comparing the newspaper and the report, they are verbatim word for word.

427. You heard the evidence which was printed in the newspapers discussed at that time?—Yes.

428. Among those who knew Mr. Forbes, what was the opinion which they expressed of the evidence of Mr. Bowley? What was the opinion of Mr. Bowley's evidence with regard to Mr. Forbes' character; was it thought that it was an attack upon him?—Yes; it was thought to be unjust. It was an attack on his veracity; whereas we thought his veracity was in our eyes unimpeachable.

429. Have you seen a paper which was put in by the last witness?—Yes; it is a communication in the Dundee newspaper. I may add, that I was the party who drew it up at the request of a number of workers at Pitcairn field.

430. At the request of a number of workers who knew him, you drew it up?—Yes; but it was discussed long before it was drawn up. It was the opinion of all the workers that it ought to have been contradicted sooner. I would beg to state, however, as I have been brought in contact with my employer in regard to that letter, that I have some explanations to make in regard to the last paragraph, if I may be allowed by the Committee to do so.

431. Is it the latter part of the last paragraph?—Yes; it is with regard to "partial ameliorations."

432. "We say that these unnatural conditions are only submitted to from the fact that we have less remuneration for 10 hours' labour than any class of operatives in the United Kingdom. Partial ameliorations——"?—Yes; that is what he objected to.

433. "Partial ameliorations have been granted of late; but we question if ever the Perthshire bleachers will reach the point indicated by Mr. Boase; namely, 'obtain all that is reasonable' without legislative enactment and supervision." Is that the part which was objected to by your employer?—Yes.

434. You wish to make some explanation upon that?—Yes.

435. Just give your explanation?—I have to state this with regard to Mr. Lumsley and the workers of Pitcairn field who engaged with him. The uniform rate of the female wages were at the bleaching and drying departments from 6½ *d.* to 7 *d.*; that the males at the beetling had 1 *s.* 3 *d.* per day; that the males at the bleaching had 1 *s.* 2 *d.* per day, and as a general rule the thing was overwrought; for eight hours they were paid the same rate as for the day's wage; eight hours overtime was counted one day for wages; and he objected to that statement, because he raised the wages in some instances.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

Mr. *H. Wilkie.*

22 April 1858.

436. So far that was incorrect, then?—No; I mean to say it must be taken in relation to Mr. Bowley's evidence, where he said that operatives had obtained all that was reasonable already. I mean to state, in justice to my employer, that he objected to that term, and I am pleased to state the concessions he made to his workpeople. In the first place he has practically granted the half-holiday to all the bleachers, and to all the people in the drying and other departments, except beetling; two o'clock or three o'clock.

437. On the Saturday?—On the Saturday. It had been granted before; but it never was practically enforced. I have likewise to state that he granted waterproof overalls to all the male and female bleachers exposed to wet work. I have likewise to state that he raised the female bleachers' wages to 10*d.* per day from 8*d.*, and some others in the drying departments higher; and the overtime in the bleaching is better paid than it was before. They do not require to work so many hours now, bleaching, as formerly, for a day's wages; but in other departments, such as in the drying department, where they have 11*d.*, and they are paid a penny an hour overtime; but the male bleachers have the same wages now that they had then, 1*s.* 2*d.* a day, with this alteration: now, instead of eight hours, but their day's overtime, they now receive four hours, or 1*s.* in four hours; but still, as that is far short of the statement given by Mr. Bowley of the wages received in his district, and as it may be understood by the Committee that the wages are the same in Perthshire, as he stated, I have made these explanations in justice to my present employer.

438. You have read the evidence which was given by Mr. Daniel Forbes to Mr. Tremenheere in 1855?—I have.

439. Do you think that the evidence which was then given by Mr. Forbes is correct?—Yes.

440. Substantially correct?—Yes.

441. With regard to the hours of work of women and young persons, he says, "Our regular hours of work are from 2 a.m. to 8 p.m. at night; but in the bleaching they go on without stopping except two hours for meals"?—Yes; they have been exceeded in some cases.

442. You mean that they were more than that in some cases?—Yes; and in others they might be less; he stated at the same time that the females and boys were not always able to rise at two o'clock, and then there must be a deduction.

443. How do you mean?—That from the excessive overtime they were not always able to get the females up at two o'clock.

444. Does he say that?—Yes.

445. He says that they are generally so tired, that if they sit down they go to sleep in a minute; that has been very much questioned; have you ever observed that?—I have observed that at the steam cans, and when exposed to the conditions that he mentions, that is to say to every alternate night, when subjected to these conditions.

446. Mr. *Kirk.*] Is there a great scarcity of hands in that neighbourhood, Pitcairn?—No; I cannot say that there is.

447. Could you not find bands to make relays of labour?—Yes; but the wages are so low that they would not have as much in ten hours; they could not well; I said that 1*s.* 2*d.* was received in some fields, and 1*s.* 3*d.*, and that the general rate of beetlers' wages in all the fields round Perthshire, with one exception, Stormfield, the general rate of male beetlers' wages is 1*s.* 4*d.* a day; Stormfield, 1*s.*; females at the beetling receive 7½*d.* to 8*d.*

448. Do you suppose that if an Act were to pass limiting the hours of labour from 10 in the day to 6 in the evening, that that would oblige the masters to give a higher rate of wages?—Yes; I think it would.

449. How would that provide employment for the parties who are now engaged in these long hours?—I think if that was divided among a given number of persons in ten hours it would require more persons to do it.

450. But if you stop at six at night you cannot work after that hour?—But the present amount of work would have to be accomplished in ten hours, and it would require a greater number of persons to accomplish it.

451. You could not hasten the process of beetling?—No; not beetling.

452. That is, your beetling?—Yes.

453. Could you hasten the process of drying?—Yes, by machinery; by steam-cans, for instance; but the cloth subjected to the action of the beetles is generally dried in the open air, except in very dull weather in winter.

454. *Chairman.*]

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

454. *Chairman.*] Do you think that the people who work in these bleach-fields are willing to run the risk of wages being reduced, supposing an Act to be passed?—Among the intelligent that is the feeling.

455. It was one of the objections to the Factory Bill, I dare say you recollect, that 10 hours' work would be a reduction of wages to the operative?—Where the work has been reduced in Perthshire to ten hours, such as Mr. Turnbull's work, the operatives have received higher wages.

456. Since the reductions of the other?—Yes; the women there have a shilling a day; and some of the males have 14 *s.* a week.

457. Mr. *Cheetham.*] Where is that work?—Mr. Turnbull's, at Huntingtower. The work referred to where the great extension of machinery has taken place.

458. He has shortened his time?—In bleaching; but in beetling it is the same.

459. In the other operations it is reduced?—Yes; the beetling is reduced, for scarcity of cloth. We are working short hours at present; that is to say, the beetles do from six in the morning to eight at night all the week over; they never stop from two on Monday morning till ten on Saturday night.

460. Mr. *Crook.*] Are the women employed in beetling as well as the men?—Men and women. The last they work is generally nine at night. It takes them about an hour. They work their beams; they then go to a bothy; the beetles go on all night. Where four men and four women are employed in one mill, one man and one woman take the work at two o'clock; then the next; then the next; and then another. It comes on in rotation; that is, once in every four nights; but they commence next morning at six o'clock, and go on with their work till 10 o'clock at night, when the same system comes round.

461. Mr. *Cheetham.*] There are women at work all night?—They do not work all night.

462. But there is one woman or two women working?—They lie upon the benches from 10 o'clock till 2.

463. Are the women, or one woman or two, employed at night at all?—Yes.

464. Always?—Yes.

465. Women are employed by relays during the night?—Not relays.

466. Is there some part of the night at which there are no women at work at the beetle?—From 10 till 2 they are lying on the benches. The machinery goes on with the work from 10 till 2.

467. You have beetles going all night?—Yes.

468. Is there a woman of some kind at work during the night?—There is a woman and a man sitting up with these beetles.

469. All the time they are going?—Yes; according to the number of sets going, and the proximity of the mulls. Where there is a mull, such as two women and two men, they are up every alternate night; there is nobody to shift with them; they cannot take turns by four, because there are not a sufficient number of hands.

470. How do these beetles continue when the rest of the work is done?—Because it is necessary to complete the process.

471. How would you deal with them in respect to legislation?—They would be compelled to take the ten hours; I see no other way of getting over the question except by having machinery. Although a ten hours' bill were passed, it is my opinion that the beetles would go till 12 o'clock at night without females, from the quantity of work done and beams filled; that is, before six in the evening. They could be shifted into the action of the beetles by males, and allowed to go to that hour.

472. With respect to the gentleman who has shortened the time of the other workpeople, will you explain why a gentleman who has adapted machinery to his works has not adapted it to the beetles?—He has put up beetles; but if we were busy I do not see how he could accomplish it.

473. Then under any system of legislation this beetling would be an exception?—Yes, except by adding to the beetling machinery.

474. Then, I understand you to say, that if a Bill were passed for ten hours, the beetling would go on from ten o'clock in the morning till twelve at night?—The beetles could go to that time without the females.

475. *Chairman.*] You mean that the beetling up to twelve o'clock might go on without women?—Yes; from six to four the beams would be shifted at eight

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

Mr. *H. Wilkie.*

22 April 1858.

or nine at night, and might go on to that hour; that is my opinion, and the opinion of other beetlers.

476. That is what you think, having considered the nature of an Act of Parliament that might be passed?—Yes.

477. The same women attend the beetling machine all through the day, and the greater part of the night?—All through the day, through the next night and the day following, when it comes to be her turn to sit up.

478. She goes on from four o'clock in the morning?—From six o'clock in the morning through that day till the next night at ten o'clock, when it is her night to sit up.

479. So that she goes through the whole night?—Yes, with the exception I have stated.

480. She is in the place where the beetling is carried on all through the night, unless it is in an adjoining room or something of that kind; does she get home and take her clothes off and go to bed?—I have known her do that after the beams were shifted.

481. Generally speaking, do they remain during the night and do they lie down on the benches as has been described to us before?—Yes.

482. That you know yourself?—Yes.

483. Is there any beetling carried on at the place where you are now at work?—Yes.

484. Do the women attend through the night there?—Yes.

485. Do they, after shifting the beams, lie down on the benches that you have spoken of?—Yes.

486. How many sets of beetles do you have in one place?—There are ten sets of beetles at Pitcairn field.

487. Is that all in one room?—No; in three different mills; but by arrangements among ourselves we shift all the mills; one man and one woman shift the whole, so that the sit up comes round only once every five nights, except when any of the parties are away.

488. Do you mean that one man and one woman would have to attend to the beetles all night?—They have nothing to do but to shift the beams beneath the beetles. When a beam has gone three or four hours it is rolled out, the one at six o'clock is rolled in, and the beetles are readjusted, and the machinery is readjusted, and they stand till six o'clock the next morning.

489. Mr. *Kirk.*] What is the actual time occupied during the night by the workers there, when the men and women change the beams?—About an hour for a woman, often more for a man, because he has to attend to the state of the water and ice, and a great number of things that may obstruct the progress of the machinery; in frosty weather I have seen these things; it is a woman's interest to help the man as much as she can, to get away to her bed.

490. But except under peculiar circumstances, is it not the fact that all that is done by the parties sitting up is simply to shift the one set of beams out, and the other set of beams in?—Yes.

491. Which would occupy about half an hour?—After ten o'clock; but still it induces lassitude and languor to the parties so exposed to it.

492. No doubt whatever that not going to bed at the proper time is injurious; but that is the fact?—Yes.

493. About half an hour is the time, you say?—An hour, I say.

494. From what hour at night to what hour in the morning?—From 10 till 2.

495. And then from two till six?—Generally. It is the practice, in some of the fields, to commence work at five o'clock, and they have to have their beams shifted by six o'clock, under a fine. That condition has been imposed at one field.

496. Is that the field at which you are employed?—No.

497. You are speaking from hearsay now, are you not?—Yes; but I understand that to be the case.

498. *Chairman.*] I understand you to say that you think an Act of Parliament, which restricted the hours of labour to six for women, would still permit the beetling to go on till 12?—Yes; I think so. That is my own opinion.

499. That is, supposing the women to assist in shifting the beams up to six?—In working them too. When cloth is first put on the beams it requires to be shifted

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

shifted often. I do not know how it is in Ireland. It does not go near four hours with us. We are constantly employed four or five hours, till we can get it to a state where it will stand three or four hours' beetling. If cloth were to go on late in the afternoon, when the women would not have time to attend to it, they could not go past six; but in every other case it is my opinion that they could go till 12.

500. Then they would begin again at six in the morning?—Yes.

501. After an interval of six hours?—Yes.

502. Now, you stated before that it is the opinion of the workers of your class that it would be desirable to have a ten hours' bill?—Yes, among the intelligent; but there are misconceptions.

503. Have you had any meetings?—In 1854; not so many since, till latterly, until Mr. Bowley's evidence came to be known, when the indignant feelings of the operatives were roused against it.

504. You state that his evidence caused meetings?—Yes; they were not public meetings. They were a number of people favourable to a ten hours' bill. It could not be called public meeting; but it resulted in an agitation and discussion of the question, and the adoption of means to do what we could to counteract his evidence.

505. Mr. *Crook.*] I understand you to say that women begin at six o'clock on the Monday morning, and work till 10 o'clock on the Tuesday night?—Yes; with the exception of the time that they are on the benches.

506. How many hours do you call that?—They rest from six to nine every night, at least generally.

507. Do they generally go home?—Yes, when the work will permit; when they have not rough cloth to put on.

508. Then they come again at nine?—Yes; and work about an hour at that time; then they commence the next morning and do the same until 10; but the work is very variable; it depends in a great measure upon the kind of cloth and the way it is brought to the beetles. Some kinds of cloth are much easier to the beetlers than others.

509. Now, as to the women's work, that is to say, the actual time the woman is obliged to be in the condition to work, that is to say, ready to work?—If she were requested she could not refuse.

510. What is the custom; what is doing to-day at these works?—Commence at six o'clock, and go on till six to-night. In some cases they may have intervals of rest; in others, none; it all depends upon the state of the cloth. They have an interval of three hours; then an hour; then, next morning, the same, until 10 o'clock at night.

511. They would alternate the one night, and the night following they do not?—If there are four, that is to say, two men and two women, they are up every alternate night; if there are six, three men and three women, they are up every third night; if there are eight, four men and four women, they are up every fourth night; if there are ten, five men and five women, they are up every fifth night; and in the vast majority of cases (there may be exceptions), some of them are only up once a week; but it requires a great number of hands together before they can accomplish that.

512. This night-work of women you are satisfied can be dispensed with by a little more machinery, you say?—I would not pretend to say by how much machinery.

513. But could any quantity of machinery dispense with it?—Oh, yes; if you employ power; but it would require to be done by steam power in Perthshire.

514. I want to know whether, in your opinion, it is possible to do away with women being employed at night by the employment of machinery?—Yes; if there was plenty of machinery to conduct the whole process of beetling in 12 hours. It is done often at slack periods, when they have more beetles than they have cloth to keep constantly employed. They are only employed, at present, from six in the morning till six at night. Then it takes us a long time to finish and fill, in that case.

515. Mr. *Kirk.*] From your last answer we are to understand that beetling engines are driven by water power?—Yes.

516. Is there much spare water power in your neighbourhood?—No; not generally. There may be seasons when there is spare water.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

Mr. H. Wilkie.

22 April 1858.

517. If the beetling engines did not go at night would there not be a waste of so much water?—Yes; the water would be allowed to go waste.

518. It must go waste to the next millowner?—It must run waste.

519. It must go to the millowner of the next establishment?—It must.

520. And therefore it would be so much power lost to the employer?—Yes. Of course he has a right to use it at night to the deterioration of the physical power and morals of the persons employed.

521. Could he not employ a second set of men?—That is a question for themselves to decide. It could be done.

522. Mr. *Crook.*] Do you not think that the master machiner could make a reservoir to impound that water; could he not increase his reservoir?—I do not think it practicable. You could not construct a reservoir without an Act of Parliament; and besides, the water power of the Tay is employed in driving the works in the neighbourhood of Perth. There might be falls got on the Almond.

523. *Chairman.*] Are all these beetling machines moved by water power?—Mr. Turnbull has erected a steam engine to drive his beetles when the water is light. I am not aware whether he has ever employed it for that purpose or not; but he can take advantage of that.

524. But it may be done by steam, just the same as machinery in any other mill can be driven by steam?—Yes; it is power.

525. Mr. *Crook.*] Is your machinery driven by water from the Tay?—From Almond River.

526. The water you have during the day would not drive extra beetles?—No; it requires the whole of the water to drive the beetles that we have in operation at present.

527. Have you sufficient beetles now?—Sometimes more than are employed at present. The present master having got possession of the place, has taken down some of the beetles, and the water may be allowed to go waste.

528. How many beetles have you at work at Pitcairn at the present time?—Ten sets. I stated that before.

529. You have 10 sets at present; what is the greatest number that ever was there; was there ever more than 10?—Oh, yes, a great number.

530. How many more than 10?—I could not answer that question.

531. A dozen?—A great deal more than that; 18 or 20.

532. If you had 20 more beetles now, could you dispense with the work of women at night?—Unquestionably.

533. You would have no difficulty as regards water power?—No.

534. You say that you have 10 beetles now, have you not?—Yes.

535. And you say that you have had 20 beetles there?—Twenty sets of beetles; but they were always scarce in dry seasons. They were always scarce of water at those times, and now they are taken down, great numbers of them; and they are adding to the bleaching machinery.

536. Mr. *Turner.*] They were taken down for want of water?—No, for want of trade. We used to finish ginghams at that place; that is a branch of trade that we now do not follow.

537. In your opinion, will the trade bear the advanced price in wages, extension of capital, and various other expenses to which the master would be put by the proposed change of law?—That is a question really for them and not for me; but, however, Mr. Turnbull has launched into a great amount of capital, and it would require capitalists to undertake the job.

538. Mr. *Kirk.*] Have the master bleachers as a class been a prosperous set of men?—I should think so.

539. I think Mr. Forbes informed us that there were some parties who had either given up the trade or stopped payment?—Only one.

540. The trustees of Patton and Brown?—Yes.

541. Did he not say something of some one else?—Not in connexion with machinery. There is one statement that I have to explain; I think I said that all the wages were uniform except Huntingtower. I have to make an exception to the bleachers' wages at Tulloch, where the wages are 1*s.* 8*d.* a day male, female 9*d.*; that is not better than other places; overtime is paid at 2*d.* per hour; and I wish to state this, because those parties who are paying very low wages pay their overtime better; and if you take 16 hours, and compare one with the other, the wages of the two are alike. At other fields, where the overtime is eight hours they are the worst paid.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

John Waring, called in; and Examined.

542. *Chairman.*] YOU were examined before the Committee on a previous occasion?—Yes.

543. Have you any explanations to make with regard to any inaccurate statements that have been made before this Committee by any masters who have been examined as witnesses?—Yes; inaccuracies on their part, and explanations which I wish to give.

544. What are the explanatinns which you wish to offer to the Committee?—Explanations on account of a refutation.

545. The last time the Committee met we had Mr. Charlton here; you have seen his evidence?—Yes.

546. Have you anything to state with respect to Mr. Charlton's evidence?—Yes, I wish to make a few observations.

547. Will you correct anything which you think requires alterntion; he stated that there were only two persons, I think, in his establishment that were against legislation, and that their names were James Atkinson and Hugh Macdonald?—I happen to know this young Macdonald, and I know that he called the first meeting that was called at Manchester for the first short-time committee, and he has been a subscriber ever since. Whether it was the same Macdonald or not I was not quite certain, but I wrote down to the Manchester committee to know whn those persons were, and this is the letter of the Manchester secretary of the Manchester committee. It is the committee of the Manchester finishers for the carrying out of the Short-Time Bill, composed of Manchester finishers and bleachers. With the permission of the Committee I will read that letter; I hope I may be allowed to do so.

548. Be good enough to read the letter?—It is as follows: "3, Hope Field, Ford-lane, Salford, 21 April 1858. Mr. Waring,—Sir, In answer to your letter which I received this morning respecting Hugh Macdonald and James Atkinson, the latter has not been with Charlton's so long, and has not much learning, and his knowledge about our humane cause is very limited; and Hugh Macdonald was the first that suggested a committee in Manchester, and has been a subscriber ever since, and all that I can say is, if he has said anything against our cause it is evident it is for the sake of his situation."

549. That is all he says?—Yes.

550. Mr. *Turner.*] He does not contradict that Hugh Macdonald has not expressed himself hostile to legislation?—No, he does not; the Manchester secretary.

551. But you think the secretary supposes, and I suppose you wish the Committee to believe, that he would be likely to lose his situation if he did not so express himself?—That is the Manchester secretary's opinion.

552. Then why do not all the rest of the people at Messrs. Charlton's lose their situations, as these two men are the exceptions; the rest, we are to infer, are favourable to legislation?—They are apprehensive that they would lose them.

553. These two men?—Yes.

554. Is not the argument quite the contrary; these two men are the only two who have expressed themselves hostile to legislation; the rest are in favour of it?—All the persons employed in that firm would have said similar, if he had asked them; I believe he has only asked those two; but I believe if he had asked every one, they would have said so.

555. How do you know that?—I have got it in a letter that he has got Brackin, and Brackin refused to sign it.

556. Brackin refused to sign what?—Refused to sign his name to this document.

557. But his name, in his own handwriting, is attached to that document?—I am alluding to the petitinn.

558. *Chairman.*] You say that you doubt whether Brackin signed it?—Yes, I do.

559. You think he did not?—Yes; I heard from the Manchester secretary that Brackin told him so.

560. There are two persons of the Manchester committee of the name of Brackin and Blatherwick?—There were two, but Blatherwick was expelled from the committee some time ago.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

John Waring.

22 April 1858.

561. To what committee did they belong?—To the short-time committee.

562. That is the bleachers?—The finishers.

563. You are old enough to remember there being a paper sent over to Bolton for the secretary to sign?—Yes; I was at the meeting that night.

564. The secretary was Mr. Pierce?—Yes.

565. Mr. *Cheetham.*] Are you at all aware that Macdonald has said anything against this movement?—No.

566. Then, for anything you know to the contrary, he is still in favour of it?—Yes.

567. To the best of your information he still contributes to it?—Yes.

568. Are you aware whether Brackin has said anything against this movement, except on the condition named in this paper. They say they are opposed to this movement, except on certain conditions?—He has not said anything besides.

569. You saw this paper that was left signed by Mr. Charlton's men?—I do not recollect having seen it.

570. Do you recollect that Mr. Charlton said that his workpeople were averse to legislation unless the warehouses were included?—I believe that a newspaper has said something to that effect.

571. That was the condition?—Yes.

572. That was what they objected to in the Short-Time Bill?—Yes.

573. Their objection to the Bill was that warehouses were not included?—Yes.

574. You have no reason to think that they objected to the Short-Time Bill as a principle?—No; they did not do that.

575. *Chairman.*] Now you say that Brackin did not sign the paper; do you mean the paper to which the Honourable Member has been referring?—I had a letter from Stewart Fletcher, to say that he had Brackin up, and that Brackin refused to sign it.

576. When you say "it," what document are you talking of?—That warehouses ought to be included in the Bill.

577. Are you aware that Mr. Charlton gave in a paper the other day?—Yes.

578. And that that paper professes to be signed by Thomas Brackin?—Yes.

579. That being the first name?—Yes.

580. That it is not a petition at all. It is merely a statement. "We, the undersigned, in the employ of Messrs. Robert Charlton and Sons, consider it would be a serious injury and injustice to our employers if a Bill for limiting the hours of labour pass the Legislature, which does not include warehouses. Our employers have laid out a large capital in providing offices and warehouse rooms for merchants, with accommodation for making up and packing their goods. If our hours of labour were limited from six to six, and warehouses not restricted, the merchants in our employers' premises would be compelled to take warehouses themselves. Some of us are in favour of a limited 'Hours Bill,' but unless the warehouses are included we would rather forego the Bill than that our employers should be injured by it." Do you say that Thomas Brackin never did put his name to this paper?—Yes; I had a letter to this effect.

581. And it is this paper that you mean?—Yes.

582. Now, you have been telling me that there was a paper taken over to Pearce, as secretary of your committee at Bolton, by Thomas Brackin and a person of the name of Blatherwick?—Yes.

583. Mr. Charlton says that Pearce signed that paper?—He did not sign the paper that they brought.

584. Mr. *Kirk.*] Did he sign any paper?—Yes.

585. *Chairman.*] Mr. Charlton puts in this paper, and he is asked, "Is that the paper which they took to Bolton?" His reply is, "It is a paper that was taken by Brackin and a person of the name of Blatherwick, one of the delegates upon the Bill of 1856." Then he is asked, "Did Blatherwick and Brackin take a paper to Bolton, and is that the paper?" "Yes." "They laid it before the operative bleachers?" "Yes." He is then asked, "Will you read the paper?" and he reads, "We, the operative bleachers, finishers, dyers, makers-up, and packers, agree to the amendment of the Bleachers' Bill as suggested by the master calenderers of Manchester, in consequence of the reasons explained to us, and the injustice that would be done to the master calenderers of Manchester if it did not include the same class of labour, wherever carried on, as is at the present time carried

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

ried on by the master calenderers of Manchester. On behalf the Central Committee. Bridge Inn, Bolton. *Richard Pearce*, Secretary. January 12, 1856."

586. Do you say that that is not a genuine paper?—It is the paper that we signed; but it is not the paper that they brought us to sign.

587. This that I have read is the paper that is signed by Richard Pearce?—Yes.

588. This which I have read then is a genuine paper?—Yes.

589. What you mean to say is, that Brackin and Blatherwick brought another paper?—Yes.

590. Not this one?—Not that one.

591. You do not dispute that that was signed?—No.

592. You do not know what the paper was, I suppose, that they brought; you have not got it?—I have not got it; but the word "warehouse" was in the paper that they brought, and we objected to that word "warehouse."

593. Was there an objection made to the word "warehouse" being in them?—Yes.

594. What was the objection to that?—Because we thought that it was intended to cheat us; we thought that if this word was introduced into this paper that they were trying to get us to sign, that they would publish the letter in the newspapers; that they were sending factory inspectors in all the warehouses and packing places in the United Kingdom, and these parties who were endeavouring to get us to sign this paper would be the very parties we thought that would oppose us in getting the Act after we had done it.

595. What was Blatherwick?—A maker-up at a calenderer's shop.

596. Was he a member of this committee in Manchester?—Yes.

597. And Brackin also?—Yes.

598. Is that committee in existence now?—Yes.

599. And are they both members of it now?—No; Blatherwick was expelled.

600. Of that you are sure, are you?—Yes.

601. Do know upon what ground he was expelled?—Yes.

602. Why was he expelled?—For causing the word "warehouse" to be put in the Bill.

603. Were you present when any discussion took place as to the propriety of expelling him?—Yes, I was present at that meeting, but I had nothing to do with his being expelled.

604. But you know that he was expelled by the meeting?—Yes; and I may just state in reference to that, that after all the word "warehouse" got into the Bill, and those letters appeared in the papers, that we were sending inspectors in all the packing establishments of the United Kingdom. Hats and shoes, and pins and needles were named in the letters.

605. Do you mean that you were afraid that you were induced to put the word "warehouse" into the Bill in order that the Bill might be more successfully attacked on account of the difficulties that would arise in examining and inspecting warehouses?—Yes.

606. Was that your opinion?—Yes; but we never did agree to put the word "warehouse" in; it was Blatherwick that put the word "warehouse" in; but it went further than that; it was stated at a meeting in Manchester by the chairman of the Commercial Association, that we were going to send them into all the counting-houses as well.

607. Mr. *Kirk.*] Is it not the fact that the word "warehouse" was in one of the Bills?—No; it was put in, but it was put in against the operatives' will, both of Manchester and Bolton, and Blatherwick was expelled for it.

608. Mr. *Davidson.*] The paper you have handed in was stated by you to be a genuine paper?—Yes; I have a letter here that I cut out of the Manchester paper, respecting sending them into the counting-houses, as stated by the chairman of the Commercial Association.

609. Mr. *Turner.*] I am the chairman of the Commercial Association; you refer to me?—I did not know that.

610. But I am the man?—Then it does not mention your name here.

611. *Chairman.*] The Bill did include the word "warehouses," did it?—Yes.

612. And when the Bill was printed, then it was attacked, if I understand you rightly, by the newspapers, as a Bill that would meet with great difficulties?—Yes.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

John Waring.

22 April 1858.

613. Do I gather from you rightly, that you think you were entrapped into using the word "warehouses," in order that the Bill might be more successfully attacked; is that your opinion?—It has been proved to demonstration that it was so.

614. Is Blatherwick the person, or one of the persons, that you think was an instrument in getting you into that trap?—He was an instrument in getting that document signed; he himself got that in.

615. He got the word "warehouses" in?—Yes.

616. Do you know, as a member of the Bleacher's Committee, that it ever was a part of your scheme of a Bill to put in the word "warehouses"?—We never had any intention of doing so; only restricting the hours of females and young persons in bleaching, and in finishing works, and in dyeing works.

617. Then the Bill, as it was presented to The House, was not the Bill that had suggested itself to your minds?—No; and it was withdrawn as soon as ever it was discovered.

618. How do you mean it was withdrawn as soon as it was discovered; it was brought into Parliament?—It was brought into Parliament.

619. It was printed?—Yes.

620. Can you tell who it was that suggested that that Bill should be withdrawn?—The working classes of Manchester and Bolton, and the promoters of the Bill. They consulted together when they saw that persons came from Manchester; and it was flying about the Lobby that we were sending inspectors into the various warehouses and counting-houses, and a great many silly letters appeared in the Manchester papers; and we thought it better to withdraw the Bill.

621. Do you find that a Bill had been presented to Parliament which was an unsatisfactory Bill?—An unsatisfactory Bill.

622. And not likely to pass?—And not likely to pass.

623. Mr. *Davidson.*] But you approved of these words if it did not include the class of labour wherever carried on?—We never did at Bolton, and they never did at Manchester. I may just state that Blatherwick and Bracken came that night at the instigation of the Manchester calenderers, and there was a bother about it, and Blatherwick was expelled in consequence of it, and the masters paid Blatherwick for coming up here and looking after it.

624. *Chairman.*] How do you know that?—I know that he said that the operatives did not pay him, and he says that the masters paid him plenty. I will substantiate that if the Committee send for them.

625. What did he say?—He said that the masters had paid him, and he brought a paper containing 60 reasons from the masters why calenderers and bleachers should be included in the Bill. Last week I had a letter from Blatherwick, and he states as one of the reasons why he wishes to put the word "warehouses" in the Bill, that the Member for Manchester gave him to understand that he would support a Bill of that character, or that he would encourage it. I have his letter here. I must say this, that I do not believe that ever the Honourable Member for Manchester insinuated anything of the sort, and I do not believe he has corresponded with him.

626. At any rate you are quite sure that the Bolton Committee never sanctioned the Bill with the word "warehouses" in it?—It was always looked upon as a desperate swindle, and is to this day, and none of the people at Manchester will look at Blatherwick in consequence of it. There are places in Manchester where they calender and finish, and there are places where they only make up and pack. We do not propose to legislate for those places where they only make up and pack.

627. Mr. *Cheetham.*] But you would include all warehouses that do calendering?—Women and children where they calender and pack, and to make up the business all through.

628. *Chairman.*] It is your complaint that there was by some one a deception practised upon you with regard to the insertion of the word "warehouse" in the Bill?—Yes.

629. Is there anything else that you would wish to explain?—Yes, there are a few points to which I wish to refer. I may just say this respecting Blatherwick, that he came up in a different name when he came up with the masters and Members of Parliament. I dare say they will furnish documents in the name of William Brennan, and that was Blatherwick, proving that they engaged untrustworthy characters to do what I call their dirty work.

630. Mr.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

630. Mr. *Turner.*] I know nothing whatever of Blatherwick, never having seen him in my life; but you expelled him, you say, from your society because he wished to introduce the idea that warehouses should be included in this Bill. You expelled him from this committee on that ground; is that so?—The operatives of Manchester excluded him for putting the word "warehouses" in this Bill.

631. You are willing that calendering houses should be included in the Bill?—Yes.

632. And finishing houses?—Yes.

633. Would it be just to the calenderer men if those persons who have carried on the same operations that warehousemen have carried on, were not also included in the Bill. I ask you whether, in your opinion, that would be just?—I believe it would be just.

634. It would be just to include the warehouses wherever such operations are carried on?—I believe it would just leave them without any law in the warehouses. I believe that it would be no injustice to the calenderer, bleachers, and finishers if the word "warehouses" was left out.

635. It would be no injustice to the calenderer man if a warehouseman carried on the same operations that the calenderer man carried on in his warehouse; it would be not unjust that he should be excluded; is that your opinion?—Yes.

636. Can you explain why?—Because in the first place they employ no women. That is one of the great objects of legislation; and in the packing establishments, I have been informed upon very good authority, when they pack and do not make up, they employ new boys, and there are very few places. There may be a few where they make up and pack, and employ a few under 18 years of age.

637. Both women and boys?—Not women.

638. Is it not a fact that in many of the warehouses in Manchester they make up and pack where they do not employ women and boys?—As far as I have been informed, they do not employ women.

639. So far as you know, adults, men only, are employed in the warehouses?—There are some boys.

640. Why should these boys not be protected in a warehouse where an owner finishes his own goods, in the same manner that they are protected when they are finishing that owner's goods when they are working in a calender-house?—I believe there is no necessity for it; these parties generally operate upon their own goods, and the only reason they make them up and pack is, that somebody comes and buys a quantity of goods, and he wishes them packed in a different form from what they are packed in the calender and bleaching places.

641. Are they not obliged to work as long in the warehouses where these operations are carried on, as they are in working out in order to be sent to the calender-houses?—Yes, but they very rarely do do it.

642. Have you had access to these large warehouses?—I have made some inquiries about it.

643. You do not know it of your own knowledge?—

644. You think you know better about it than I do?—I do not say that.

645. Do you not know that there are several large warehouses in Manchester where calendering and packing is carried on, on much the same principle that I have been referring to?—Yes.

646. You would wish to include them?—I would have the same as the Factory Bill, wherever steam-power is used for carrying on bleaching, calendering, or packing.

647. Do you know that, in this establishment of Mr. Charlton's, merchants have offices where they carry on their business and send their goods to be finished into the works?—Yes.

648. And you would have Mr. Charlton included in the Bill?—Yes.

649. If these different merchants gave up their establishments there, and set up establishments for themselves, would you not include them also in the Bill?—Not if they did not calender.

650. But I say, if they did finish and calender?—Then they would be included in the Bill.

651. Then the word warehouse would be a necessary term to introduce into the Bill, would it not?—No.

652. Why?—I would not put the word "warehouse" in; it has no need to be in the Bill after all.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

John Waring.

22 April 1858.

653. In that case they would not be carrying on the trade of calender-men?—They would not be calenderers in their own warehouses.

654. But they do calender now in their own warehouses?—They may call the building what they like, but it is not customary to call a calendering place a warehouse.

655. Mr. *Davidson.*] How do you mean that the word "warehouse" is necessary to catch a certain class of trade; how do you explain that?—We do not propose to legislate for the makers-up and packers in Manchester, where there are no finishers and bleachers; we never did. With respect to drawing the line of demarcation where it is to start and end, that is for the Committee, and not for me.

656. Mr. *Turner.*] Now, you expelled a man named Blatherwick from your society, or the operatives of Manchester did, because he introduced the word "warehouse," and followed out your idea?—Yes, they expelled him for that.

657. Do you think that just?—I have nothing to do with it; it was the Manchester committee themselves. They did not expel him exactly for that, but for inserting the word "warehouse" against the wish of the committee of Manchester and the committee of Bolton.

658. If your principle were carried fairly out, you would interfere with trade to such an extent that you would raise an immense opposition against you; was not that your feeling?—My opinion was that the enemies, or those who pretended to be our friends, would oppose us on those grounds; my opinion was, that if we introduced either the word "warehouse" or "carried on," they would say we were going to places that we never intended to go to.

659. But it is necessary, to carry out your principle, that you should have the words "carried on"?—Not with respect to factories.

660. Bleaching, dyeing, finishing, and calendering?—I believe there is no necessity for restricting the boys employed in warehouses in Manchester.

661. Not if calendering and packing is carried on?—Yes, if calendering is carried on; but not making up and packing.

662. Then you have no objection to women and boys being employed in warehouses any hours, provided there is not calendering going on?—Provided there is not calendering and finishing.

663. Therefore you do not protect women and boys under those circumstances?—We are not aware that there are any women.

664. *Chairman.*] To carry the principle fairly out, ought you not to include the warehouses in all such places; I take it that what you want to do is to get this Bill for yourselves, for bleachers and dyers?—Yes.

665. You would do that if you could which the Honourable Member says would be so fair, I suppose?—Yes.

666. You would give it to everybody?—Yes, if we could; but we find we cannot.

667. You think that there are difficulties in your way?—Yes, that would impede our progress.

668. You are old enough to remember that one of the great arguments constantly used against factory legislation was, that you ought to include bleaching works?—I remember it very well.

669. Still the Legislature thought it would do what it could, although it could not do all that it would wish to do?—Certainly.

670. And it therefore passed a Factory Act?—Yes.

671. You remember these things, I dare say?—Yes.

672. It was put very pointedly to you, whether you thought it fair that certain suggestions which you make should be carried into effect. Do you not think it fair to do the best you can for the purpose of altering the present state of things?—I think it very wrong that they should work in bleaching works and finishing works as long as they do, in consequence of a few warehouses standing in their way.

673. You were very early afraid that the introduction of the word "warehouses" would be an obstruction to your Bill?—We found it out to be so.

674. Have you any explanation to make with regard to Sir James Graham's reason for excusing the bleaching works in the Print Works Bill?—Mr. Hardcastle made reference to the inquiry of that year, 1847, and the only explanation that I wish to give is this, that none of the operatives were examined before that commission; none of the people of Bolton, none of our committee ever knew

that

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

John Waring.

22 April 1858.

that there was a commission. I cannot find any of our people that ever knew anything about the commission, therefore if there was an inquiry it was a very partial one.

675. Which commission was that?—The commission of 1847.

676. Have you any further explanations that you wish to make to the Committee?—Yes, I have several statements; I have one statement here which was given in by Mr. Hardcastle, where he says his buyers were going away at dinner time with a day's wages in their pockets.

677. Mr. *Crook.*] Do you consider your evidence impugned in any way?—No, they never contradicted anything of mine; only there was one witness asked one of the bleaching masters if he had not given me an acquitttance paper. He said no. I never said any bleaching master had given me an acquitance paper. I have come up here at the wish of the operatives, because they dare not speak their minds exactly, and I dare speak mine in defence of truth; and I have documents that will bear me out in stating that some of the masters' evidence is not correct.

678. Mr. *Kirk.*] You want to prove by documents that the masters' evidence is incorrect?—Yes.

679. And you say that the parties who have furnished you with these documents are unable or unwilling to come here?—Yes.

Martis, 27° *die Aprilis*, 1858.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Davidson.	Mr. Baxter.
Mr. Kirk.	Mr. Clark.
Mr. Turner.	Colonel Forde.
Lord John Manners.	

J. M. COBBETT, Esq., IN THE CHAIR.

James Aspinal Turner, Esq., a Member of the House; Examined.

J. A. Turner, Esq., M.P.

27 April 1858.

680. *Chairman.*] IN consequence of what transpired before this Committee on its last assembling, and in consequence of what was stated by the witness, John Waring, with regard to the signature of Thomas Brackin to a document put in by Mr. Charlton on a former day, did you go to Manchester for the purpose of seeing Brackin, and ascertaining whether he had signed this paper or not?—That was one of my objects in going to Manchester: I felt exceedingly indignant that a man so respectable as Mr. Charlton, of Manchester, should be impugned as putting in a document containing a forgery. I went down to Manchester, put myself in communication with Mr. Charlton, and said to him, "Will you send that man, Thomas Brackin, to my office?" He went there; I then told him what John Waring had stated, and he replied, "Oh! of course I signed it, and all the other people signed it." I said, "Well, perhaps the Committee will not be satisfied except you state it in writing;" so with the assistance of a clerk a letter was drawn up, which he said was perfectly true, and he affixed his signature to it. Two gentlemen in my office testified to his having signed that letter. A person also came up with him from Messrs. Charlton's works, who brought that original document with him, which I suppose had been returned; and he stated, "I can testify that every signature, not only Brackin's, but every other signature attached to that document was placed there voluntarily by the parties in my presence:" I said to him, "Will you testify to that on the document itself?" and he, without any interference of mine, wrote what is now upon that document.

681. Upon the outside of this document?—On the inside of it. The words are: "I hereby testify that the whole of the signatures annexed were witnessed by me, and that the whole are genuine signatures. George Twittet, Manchester, 26 April 1858."

682. That

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit

A. Turner, Esq., M.P.

27 April 1858.

682. That letter I think you say was drawn up in your office?—Yes, it was drawn up by a clerk of mine.

683. In your office?—Yes.

684. And you saw Brackin sign it?—I saw Brackin sign it.

685. Be good enough to hand it in?—Yes.

[*The Witness handed in the following Document*:]

To the Chairman of the Select Committee on Bleaching and Dyeing Works.

Sir, Manchester, 26 April 1858.

I have heard that a document purporting to convey the opinions of 53 workpeople employed in the calendering, making up, and packing establishment of Messrs. Robert Charlton and Sons, in this city, was handed in to your Honourable Committee, on the 15th of this month, by Mr. Henry Charlton; and I have further heard that, on the 22d of this month, a witness, named John Waring, stated before your Honourable Committee, that he had received information from Manchester that my name, which appeared at the head of the signatures to that document, was not placed there by my own hand, and must therefore have been supposed to have been a forgery.

In consequence of such an unwarrantable statement having been made, I consider it to be my duty to write this letter, in order that I may inform your Honourable Committee that I voluntarily affixed my own name to that document; that I feel confident that all the other signatures were equally genuine; and that I feel great indignation that so gross a slander should have been circulated affecting the honour of my employers, in which service I have been engaged 31 years.

I remain, Sir,
Your very humble servant,
Thomas Brackin.

Signed by Thomas Brackin, 26 April 1858,
in our presence,

G. Milnes, 50, Croft-street, Manchester.

J. Budger, 50, Cross-street, Manchester.

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit